# 1NC

## 1

#### 1] Interpretation - Reduce means permanent reduction – it’s distinct from “waive” or “suspend.”

**Reynolds 59** (Judge (In the Matter of Doris A. Montesani, Petitioner, v. Arthur Levitt, as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al., Respondents [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL] Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department 9 A.D.2d 51; 189 N.Y.S.2d 695; 1959 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 7391 August 13, 1959, lexis)

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.  [\*\*\*13] 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.

#### Waiver is temporary.

Green 5/6 [Andrew Green (Devex Contributing Reporter based in Berlin, his coverage focuses primarily on health and human rights and he has previously worked as Voice of America's South Sudan bureau chief and the Center for Public Integrity's web editor). “US backs waiver for intellectual property rights for COVID-19 vaccines”. Devex. 06 May 2021. Accessed 7/31/2021. <https://www.devex.com/news/us-backs-waiver-for-intellectual-property-rights-for-covid-19-vaccines-99847> //Xu]

In a stunning reversal, U.S. President Joe Biden’s administration came out in favor of waiving intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines Wednesday. The move follows months of U.S. opposition that began under former President Donald Trump to a proposal from South Africa and India to temporarily set aside intellectual property rights around products that would protect, contain, and treat COVID-19. Its supporters have argued that the proposal, first tabled at the World Trade Organization in October and now backed by more than 100 countries, is necessary to expand vaccine production and overcome global shortages.

#### 2] Violation – the plan waives intellectual property protections temporarily, which is an indefinite suspension.

#### 3] Vote neg for limits and neg ground – re-instatement under any infinite number of conditions doubles aff ground – every plan becomes either temporary or permanent – you cherry-pick the best criteria and I must prep every aff while they avoid core topic discussions like reduction-based DAs which decks generics like Pharma Innovation and Bio-Tech.

#### 5] TVA solves – permanently reduce COVID patents.

#### Fairness and education are voters – its how judges evaluate rounds and why schools fund debate

#### Neg theory is DTD - 1ARs control the direction of the debate because it determines what the 2NR has to go for – DTD allows us some leeway in the round by having some control in the direction

#### Competing interps – Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation – it also collapses since brightlines operate on an offense-defense paradigm

#### No RVIs – A – Going all in on theory kills substance education which outweighs on timeframe B - Discourages checking real abuse which outweighs on norm-setting C – Encourages theory baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly D – its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments E - Kills norm setting since debaters can never admit they’re wrong – outweighs since norm setting is the constitutive purpose of theory F – They are the logic of criminalization that over-punish people-of-color for trying to create productive discourse

#### Their t preempts don’t apply to this shell – u can still defend covid, and generics don’t check you just link out

## 2

#### Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than whole res then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)*

#### B. Violation:

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair –

#### a) Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides.

#### b) Shiftiness-Having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things.

#### 2. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Having one also encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.

## 3

#### Interpretation – the Affirmative must present a delineated enforcement mechanism for the Plan. There is no normal means since terms are negotiated contextually among member states.

WTO No Date "Whose WTO is it anyway?" <https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/org1_e.htm> //Elmer

**When WTO rules impose disciplines** on countries’ policies, **that is the outcome of negotiations among WTO members.** The rules are **enforced** **by** the **members themselves** **under agreed procedures that they negotiated**, **including the possibility of trade sanctions**. But those sanctions are imposed by member countries, and authorized by the membership as a whole. This is quite different from other agencies whose bureaucracies can, for example, influence a country’s policy by threatening to withhold credit.

#### Violation: they don’t

#### Standards

#### 1] Shiftiness- They can redefine the 1AC’s enforcement mechanism in the 1AR which allows them to recontextualize their enforcement mechanism to wriggle out of DA’s since all DA links are predicated on type of enforcement i.e. sanctions bad das, domestic politics das off of backlash, information research sharing da if they put monetary punishments, or trade das.

#### 2] Real World - Policy makers will always specify how the mandates of the plan should be endorsed. It also means zero solvency, absent spec, states can circumvent the Aff’s policy since there is no delineated way to enforce the affirmative which means there’s no way to actualize any of their solvency arguments.

#### ESpec isn’t regressive or arbitrary- it’s an active part of the WTO is central to any advocacy about international IP law since the only uniqueness of a reduction of IP protections is how effective its enforcement is.

## 4

#### The World Trade Organization ought to increase intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines The United States ought to designate intellectual property protections on COVID-19 vaccines as adversely affecting the international transfer of technology.

#### Member states can waive IP rights if they hamper the international flow of medical technology.

WTO ’21 (World Trade Organization; 2021; “Obligations and exceptions”; World Trade Organization; Accessed: 8-30-2021; exact date not provided, but copyright was updated in 2021)

Article 8 Principles […] 2. Appropriate measures, provided that they are consistent with the provisions of this Agreement, **may be needed** to prevent the abuse of intellectual property rights by right holders or the resort to practices which unreasonably restrain trade or **adversely affect** the **international transfer of technology**. SECTION 8: CONTROL OF ANTI-COMPETITIVE PRACTICES IN CONTRACTUAL LICENCES Article 40 1. Members agree that some licensing practices or conditions pertaining to intellectual property rights which restrain competition may have **adverse effects on trade** and **may impede** the **transfer and dissemination** of technology. 2. Nothing in this Agreement **shall prevent** Members from specifying in their legislation licensing practices or conditions that may in particular cases constitute an abuse of intellectual property rights having an adverse effect on competition in the relevant market. As provided above, a Member **may adopt**, consistently with the other provisions of this Agreement, **appropriate measures** to **prevent or control** such practices, which may include for example exclusive grantback conditions, conditions preventing challenges to validity and coercive package licensing, in the light of the relevant laws and regulations of that Member. […]

#### Designating IP protections as antithetical to the global health system revitalizes info-sharing.

Youde ’16 (Jeremy; writer for World Politics Review; 4-29-2016; “Technology **Transfer** Is a **Weak Link** in the Global Health System”; World Politics Review; <https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/18639/technology-transfer-is-a-weak-link-in-the-global-health-system>; Accessed: 8-30-2021)

In mid-April, a spokesperson for the Ugandan government admitted that the country’s only functioning cancer treatment machine had broken earlier that month. The radiotherapy machine, donated by China to Uganda in 1995 and housed at Mulago Hospital in Kampala, is now considered beyond repair. While the government did acquire a second radiotherapy machine in 2013, it has not been operational because of delays in allocating 30 billion shillings—just shy of $9 million—to construct a new building to house it. The funding delay has lifted, but the machine won’t be up and running for at least six months. The government has announced plans to airlift some cancer patients to Nairobi for treatment, but that plan will only accommodate 400 of the estimated 17,000 to 33,000 cancer patients who need treatment annually in Uganda. This breakdown of technology is a human tragedy for the cancer patients from Uganda as well as elsewhere in East Africa that the radiotherapy machine helped treat. Beyond the personal level, though, the episode illustrates a larger shortcoming in global health. Total annual development assistance for health is approximately $36 billion, but that funding is overwhelmingly concentrated on specific infectious diseases. Noncommunicable diseases like cancer receive relatively little international funding—only 1.3 percent in 2015, and the dollar amount has declined since 2013. Funds to strengthen health systems, geared toward building and supporting a resilient health care system, are similarly low, making up only 7.3 percent of development assistance in 2015. Noncommunicable diseases kill more people every year than infectious diseases and accidents do, but this balance is not reflected in global health spending. ... These shortcomings also speak to larger problems in global health around issues of **technology transfers** and long-term **commitments** to keep that technology working. It’s one thing to provide necessary medical technologies in the first place; it’s another to ensure that those technologies are accessible and operational going forward. Despite the **importance** of technology transfers, questions of **long-term support** for them have received relatively little attention from the global health regime. As noncommunicable diseases like cancer cause an even-higher proportion of deaths each year, it will become all the more **imperative** that the international community address this gap in **sharing** and funding **crucial health care** technology. This does not mean that there are no efforts to facilitate technology transfers around the world. The Fogarty International Center, a part of the U.S. National Institutes of Health, has had an [Office of Technology Transfer](http://www.fic.nih.gov/News/GlobalHealthMatters/march-april-2014/Pages/technology-transfer-nih-ott.aspx) since 1989 to make medical innovations developed in the United States more widely available. The World Health Organization (WHO) also has a [Technology Transfer Initiative](http://www.who.int/phi/programme_technology_transfer/en/) to improve access to health care technologies in developing countries. These efforts are laudable, but their interpretation of technology transfer is almost entirely rooted in access to pharmaceuticals and vaccines. To be sure, that is a very important issue—but it only deals with one narrow element of technology transfer. The problems of global health technology transfers illustrated in Uganda underscore a larger issue: the need for a so-called fourth industrial revolution, what has been described as “blurring the real world with the technological world.” This idea gained prominence earlier this year when it served as the theme for the World Economic Forum in Davos. For global health, this means embracing technology to find low-cost ways to promote health, spread education, and reach communities whose access to the health care infrastructure is weak. It expands on the notion of telemedicine and eHealth to make it more encompassing. According to health care entrepreneur Jonathan Jackson, the fourth industrial revolution could change global health by encouraging a shift in focus “from healthcare to health promotion.” Moving from high-cost treatment to low-cost prevention, he has argued, will have significant and far-reaching positive economic implications for developing countries around the world. Its inspiring sense of technological optimism notwithstanding, this sort of approach cannot be the sole focus of technology transfers in global health. Prevention is indeed important, but the fact of the matter remains that people will get sick—and those sick people will need treatment. Mobile applications and electronic access to health care providers can be useful, but they cannot replace a radiotherapy machine. Understanding the root causes of noncommunicable diseases goes far beyond individual choices and intersects with the larger political, economic and social context, so we cannot assume that cybertechnology alone can stop cancer. It is also important to remember that the results of greater technological innovation and integration won’t be free. Sub-Saharan African states, on average, spend $200 per person per year on health care. Even if technology allows costs to decline, they are still likely to be out of reach for many people in most of these countries—in the same way that the purchase and maintenance of medical technologies are prohibitively expensive in these same states today. Technology in and of itself is not useful unless it can be maintained over the long term. This, then, is a weak link in the larger global health system: How do we ensure access to life-prolonging medical technologies beyond pharmaceuticals and vaccines in a sustainable way? Consider two ideas. First, development assistance for health must orient more of its resources toward treating noncommunicable diseases and strengthening health systems. These are the areas in which these technologies are likely to be used, but are not currently supported by the international system. The changing nature of health and disease will only make them even more important in the years to come. Second, longer-term funding commitments would provide a greater opportunity to incorporate medical technologies into health care systems sustainably. Machines will break down, and technologies will fail. That is inevitable. But the global health regime, from the WHO and its regional organizations like the Regional Office for Africa to major donors like the **U**nited **S**tates government and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, needs to figure out how to ensure that these problems do not put **lives in peril**. Technology alone will not improve global health unless it is properly supported and funded.

#### International collaboration’s key to check future pandemics – otherwise, extinction.

Dulaney ’20 [Michael; digital journalist with the ABC June 2020; "'A question of when, not if': Another pandemic is coming – and sooner than we think", No Publication; https://www.abc.net.au/news/science/2020-06-07/a-matter-of-when-not-if-the-next-pandemic-is-around-the-corner/12313372, accessed 4-12-2021]

And as recently as September last year — just a few months before COVID-19 was detected in China — an independent watchdog set up by the WHO warned the world was "grossly" unprepared for the "very real threat" of a pandemic. But even more alarming is what the new coronavirus indicates about the future. Researchers say human impacts on the natural world are causing new infectious diseases to emerge more frequently than ever before, meaning the next pandemic — one perhaps even worse than COVID-19 — is only a matter of time. "We know that it's a probability, not a possibility," Dr Reid says. "The roulette wheel will start to spin again. "If you don't resolve the conditions that generated the problem, then we sit waiting for the next probability equation to come through. "And it will, and sadly it's possible that it's in our lifetime." The growing threat to human health Nearly all emerging pathogens like COVID-19 come from "zoonotic transfer" — essentially, when a virus present in animals jumps to infect humans. The US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates three out of every four new infectious diseases, and nearly all pandemics, emerge this way. Researchers have counted around 200 infectious diseases that have broken out more than 12,000 times over the past three decades. On average, one new infectious disease jumps to humans every four months. Animal species like civet cats (SARS), camels (MERS), horses (Hendra), pigs (Nipah) and chimpanzees (HIV) have all been implicated in the spread of new viruses at different times.

## 5

#### Text – the United States ought to

#### anonymously invest $25 billion into 25 production lines dedicated solely to COVID-19 vaccines to boost global vaccine production managed by the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.

#### distribute 8 billion doses of COVID vaccines using an equitable distribution framework prioritizing developing countries

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

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

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

## 6

#### Climate Patents and Innovation high now and solving Warming but COVID waiver sets a dangerous precedent for appropriations - the mere threat is sufficient is enough to kill investment.

Brand 5-26, Melissa. “Trips Ip Waiver Could Establish Dangerous Precedent for Climate Change and Other Biotech Sectors.” IPWatchdog.com | Patents & Patent Law, 26 May 2021, www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/26/trips-ip-waiver-establish-dangerous-precedent-climate-change-biotech-sectors/id=133964/. //sid

The biotech industry is making remarkable advancestowards climate change solutions, and it is precisely for this reason that it can expect to be in the crosshairs of potential IP waiver discussions. President Biden is correct to refer to climate change as an existential crisis. Yet it does not take too much effort to connect the dots between President Biden’s focus on climate change and his Administration’s recent commitment to waive global IP rights for Covid vaccines (TRIPS IP Waiver). “This is a global health crisis, and the extraordinary circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures.” If an IP waiver is purportedly necessary to solve the COVID-19 global health crisis (and of course [we dispute this notion](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/04/19/waiving-ip-rights-during-times-of-covid-a-false-good-idea/id=132399/)), can we really feel confident that this or some future Administration will not apply the same logic to the climate crisis? And, without the confidence in the underlying IP for such solutions, what does this mean for U.S. innovation and economic growth? United States Trade Representative (USTR) [Katherine Tai](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/05/tai-says-united-states-will-back-india-southafrica-proposal-waive-ip-rights-trips/id=133224/) was subject to questioning along this very line during a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing. And while Ambassador Tai did not affirmatively state that an IP waiver would be in the future for climate change technology, she surely did not assuage the concerns of interested parties. The United States has historically supported robust IP protection. This support is one reason the United States is the center of biotechnology innovation and leading the fight against COVID-19. However, a brief review of the domestic legislation arguably most relevant to this discussion shows just how far the international campaign against IP rights has eroded our normative position. The Clean Air Act, for example, contains a provision allowing for the mandatory licensing of patents covering certain devices for reducing air pollution. Importantly, however, the patent owner is accorded due process and the statute lays out a detailed process regulating the manner in which any such license can be issued, including findings of necessity and that no reasonable alternative method to accomplish the legislated goal exists. Also of critical importance is that the statute requires compensation to the patent holder. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Act contemplates mandatory licensing of patents covering inventions of primary importance in producing or utilizing atomic energy. This statute, too, requires due process, findings of importance to the statutory goals and compensation to the rights holder. A TRIPS IP waiver would operate outside of these types of frameworks. There would be no due process, no particularized findings, no compensationand no recourse. Indeed, the fact that the World Trade Organization (WTO) already has a process under the TRIPS agreement to address public health crises, including the compulsory licensing provisions, with necessary guardrails and compensation, makes quite clear that the waiver would operate as a free for all. Forced Tech Transfer Could Be on The Table When being questioned about the scope of a potential TRIPS IP waiver, Ambassador Tai invoked the proverb “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” While this answer suggests primarily that, in times of famine, the Administration would rather give away other people’s fishing rods than share its own plentiful supply of fish (here: actual COVID-19 vaccine stocks), it is apparent that in Ambassador Tai’s view waiving patent rights alone would not help lower- and middle-income countries produce their own vaccines. Rather, they would need to be taught how to make the vaccines and given the biotech industry’s manufacturing know-how, sensitive cell lines, and proprietary cell culture media in order to do so. In other words, Ambassador Tai acknowledged that the scope of the current TRIPS IP waiver discussions includes the concept of forced tech transfer. In the context of climate change, the idea would be that companies who develop successful methods for producing new seed technologies and sustainable biomass**,** reducing greenhouse gases in manufacturing and transportation, capturing and sequestering carbon in soil and products, and more, would be required to turn over their proprietaryknow-how to global competitors. While it is unclear how this concept would work in practice and under the constitutions of certain countries, the suggestion alone could be devastating to voluntary internationalcollaborations. Even if one could assume that the United States could not implement forced tech transfer on its own soil, what about the governments of our international development partners? It is not hard to understand that a U.S.-based company developing climate change technologies would be unenthusiastic about partnering with a company abroad knowing that the foreign country’s government is on track – with the assent of the U.S. government – to change its laws and seize proprietary materials and know-how that had been voluntarily transferred to the local company. Necessary Investment Could Diminish Developing climate change solutions is not an easy endeavor and bad policy positions threaten the likelihood that they will materialize. These products have long lead times from research and development to market introduction, owing not only to a high rate of failure but also rigorous regulatory oversight. Significant investment is required to sustain and drive these challenging and long-enduring endeavors. For example, synthetic biology companies critical to this area of innovation [raised over $1 billion in investment in the second quarter of 2019 alone](https://www.bio.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/Climate%20Report_FINAL.pdf). If investors cannot be confident that IP will be in place to protect important climate change technologies after their long road from bench to market, it is unlikely they will continue to investat the current and required levels**.**

#### Climate Patents are critical to solving Warming – only way to stimulate Renewable Energy Technology Investment.

Aberdeen 20 Arielle Aberdeen October 2020 "Patents to climate rescue: how intellectual property rights are fundamental to the development of renewable energy" <https://www.4ipcouncil.com/application/files/4516/0399/1622/Intellectual_Property_and_Renewable_Energy.pdf> (Caribbean Attorney-at-Law with extensive experience in legal research and writing.)//Elmer

**Climate change is** the **most pressing** global **challenge** and with the international commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions under the Paris Agreement,1 there **needs to be a global energy revolution** and transition.2 This is where **innovative technology can help** meet the challenge of reducing our dependency on finite natural capital resources. The development and deployment of innovative technology play a pivotal role in enabling us to replace fossil fuel use with more sustainable energy solutions. **Patents** have **facilitated** the **development of such innovative technologies** thus far **and** will **continue to be the catalyst for this transition**. Patents are among a group of intellectual property rights (‘IPRs’). 3 These are private and exclusive rights given for the protection of different types of intellectual creations. IPRs are the cornerstone of developed and knowledge-based economies, as they encourage innovation, drive the investment into new areas and allow for the successful commercialisation of intellectual creations. IPRs are the cornerstone of developed and knowledge-based economies. Empirical evidence has shown that a **strong IPRs** system **influences** both the **development and diffusion of technology**. Alternatively, **weak IPRs** protection has been shown to **reduce** **innovation**, **reduce investment** and prevent firms from entering certain markets.4 Once patent protection has been sought and granted, it gives a time-limited and exclusive rights to the creator of an invention. This allows the inventor or patentor the ability to restrict others from using, selling, or making the new invented product or process. Thereby allowing a timelimited monopoly on the exploitation of the invention in the geographical area where it is protected. During the patent application procedure, the patentor must make sufficient public disclosure of the invention. This will allow others to see, understand and improve upon it, thereby spurring continuous innovation. Therefore, the patent system through providing this economic incentive is a successful tool which has encouraged the development and the dissemination of technology. Patents like all IPRs are key instruments in the global innovation ecosystem.5 When developing innovative technology, patents play a role throughout the “technological life cycle”,6 as shown in Figure 1. This lifecycle involves the invention, research and development (‘R&D’), market development and commercial diffusion. Patents are most effective when sought at the R&D stage. Once a patent has been granted, it becomes an asset which can then be used to7: Gain Market Access: Patents can create market advantages; to develop and secure market position; to gain more freedom to operate within a sector and reduce risks of infringing on other patents; protect inventions from being copied, and removes delaying by innovative firms to release new or improved technology and encourage the expansion of their markets. Negotiation leverage: Patents can build a strong brand or company reputation which can enhance the company’s negotiation power and allow for the creation of equal partnerships. Funding: Patents can generate funding and revenue streams for companies. Having a strong patent portfolio especially in small businesses or start-ups can be used to leverage investor funding; while also be a source of revenue for companies through licensing fees, sales, tax incentives, collateral for loans and access to grants and subsidies. Strategic value: Patents can be used to build “synergistic partnerships”8 through which collaboration on R&D and other partnerships; be used to improve in-house R&D and build and/ or develop more products. As such, obtaining and managing patent as part of a patent and broader IPRs strategy are key tools for business success, especially within highly innovative and technology-driven industries.9 Renewable Energy: The Basics Renewable energy is derived from natural unlimited sources which produce little to no harmful greenhouse gases and other pollutants. 10 Innovative renewable energy technologies (‘RETs’) have created the ability to tap into these sources and convert them to energy which can then be stored, distributed, and consumed at a competitive cost. RETs have developed into a technology ecosystem which consists of alternative energy production, energy conservation and green transportation.11 For energy production, RETs have been developed to generate energy from six main sources. These are: Wind energy: Technology, via off-shore and/or on-shore wind turbines, harnesses the energy produced by the wind. Solar energy: Technology either through concentrated solar power (‘CSP’)and solar photovoltaic (‘PV’) harnesses the energy produced by the sun. Hydropower: Technology either through large-scale or small-scale hydropower plants, captures energy from flowing water. Bioenergy: Technology is used to convert organic material into energy either through burning to produce heat or power or through converting it to a liquid biofuel. Geothermal: Technology is used to capture the energy from the heat produced in the earth’s core. Ocean/Tidal energy: Technology is used to capture the energy produced from waves, tides, salinity gradient energy and ocean thermal energy conversion. Out of these six sources, the wind, solar and hydropower energy sectors are the biggest, the most developed and the most widely used. While geothermal and ocean energy sources are used in a more limited capacity. In particular, the RETs in ocean energy is still at its infancy and thus presents an opportunity for future innovation and commercialisation. Renewable energy is the fastest-growing energy source, with the electricity sector showing the fastest energy transition. 12 In 2016, renewable energy accounted for 12% of final global energy consumption and in 2018, a milestone was reached with renewables being used to generate 26% of global electricity. The source of this energy has been driven by renewable hydropower, as shown in Figure 2, with wind and solar energy trailing behind in energy production. However, the International Energy Agency (‘IRENA’) forecasts that Solar PV will lead RETs to increase capacity in the upcoming years. 13 This rise in renewable energy is due to the increased investment into the sector and the development, diffusion and deployment of innovative RETs. For the period between 2010 and 2019, there were 2.6 trillion US dollars invested in renewable energy. 14 The majority of which being focused on solar energy. 15 This investment has surpassed the investment made into the traditional fossil fuel energy 16 and has been heavily driven by the private sector. 17 The International Energy Agency recent report showed that its members increased the public budgets for energy technology R&D, with the biggest increase in the low-carbon sectors.18 The geographic sources of this investment shown in Figure 3, reveals that the European Union, the United States and Japan are part of the largest investors. This reflects the historic involvement these countries have had in the renewable energy arena and the development of RETs. However, there is now the emergence of China, India and Brazil as large investors in this field. This trend in investment has also coincided with the increase in patenting technology in renewable energy compared to fossil fuels.19 Reports from the World Intellectual Property Office (WIPO), have shown that there has been a **steady increase in patent filing rates in RETs since the mid-1990s**.20 This increase has occurred in the four major renewable sectors, 21 where RETs patents applications were growing steadily from 2005 until reaching a peak in 2013.22 Post-2013, there has been a slight decline in patent filings, which can indicate a maturing of sectors and deployment of technologies.23 Each renewable energy sector is at a different stage of maturity and thus there is a variation of patent ownership. The wind sector is the most mature and consequently has the highest intellectual property ownership and patent grants compared to that of the biofuel sector. 24 IRENA also provides a comprehensive and interactive database for RETs patents. As seen in Figure 4 below, they have collected patent data from the major patent filing jurisdiction25 which shows the breakdown of the patents per type. This information reveals that there is a dominance of patent filings focused on solar technology. This data corresponds to the focus of the investment in renewable energy into solar energy. Upon closer look at the data, the geographic source of these patents shows that RETs patents have been concentrated in a few developed OECD countries and China. This also corresponds to the source of investment shown in Figure 3 and reflects the historical concentration of RETs innovation within these countries. 26 The latest WIPO report for 2019, which looks at the data for PCT patent applications, shows that 76 % of all PCT patent application came from the United States, Germany, Japan, the Republic of Korea and China.27 China is the newest entry into the top ten list and has made one of the largest jumps to become one of the biggest RETs patent filers at the PCT. This geographic data is also mirrored by IRENA’s statistics, as shown in Figure 5 below. This data also reflects China’s emerging renewable dominance. China is heavily **investing in solar energy** **technology** and has filed numerous patents in this area and the underlying technologies.28 The successful flow of investment in this sector can only **occur in** the **presence of a strong IPRs system** and protection. Government policies and initiatives to improve the **patent system** can be used to promote the development of RETs and drive private capital and investment into this area.29 This direct **effect on RETs** through policies was **shown in** the United States with the ‘**Green Tech Pilot Program’**.30 This was a special accelerated patent application procedure developed by the United States Patent and Trademark Office for inventions falling under the green technology category. This program ran from 2009-2011 and led to a boost in RETs patent applications, with the office issuing 1062 RETs patents from the programme. Other jurisdictions, such as the European Union and China have used policy and incentives to promote the development of RETs and the advancement of their renewable energy sector. In particular, the European Union and China began the renewable energy path at different starting points but are now both dominant players in this area.

#### 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.

## 7

#### Counterplan Text – States ought to eliminate their nuclear arsenals – solves adv 1 – their only terminal impact is nuke war.

## 8

#### NC theory first - 1] They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] We have more speeches to norm over it 3] It was introduced first so it comes lexically prior.

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology 3] 1st and last speech 4] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to

#### DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up blippy 20 second shells in the 2AR but I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew

#### No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A] New 1ar paradigms moot any 1NC theoretical offense B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested

#### I get 2NR theory – anything else allows them to sever which kills education

#### Just because you spend more time on an argument doesn’t mean you prioritize it – the k doesn’t come first if I spend 5 mins of the 1nc reading it. The 2n overcovers theory which takes out the second arg.

## Case

### Advantage 1

#### Africa Scenario -

#### 1] Multiple Alt-Causes to African instability – we’ll insert a re-cutting

Mead 13. [(Walter Mead is a James Clarke Chace Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities, Bard College) “Peace in The Congo? Why the World Should Care,” The American Interest, December 15, 2013. <https://www.the-american-interest.com/2013/12/15/peace-in-the-congo-why-the-world-should-care/> //Re-cut by Elmer

One of the biggest questions of the 21st century is whether this destructive dynamic can be contained, or whether the demand for ethnic, cultural and/or religious homogeneity will continue to convulse world politics, drive new generations of conflict, and create millions more victims. The **Congo conflict** is a disturbing piece of evidence suggesting that, in Africa at least, there is potential for this kind of conflict. The Congo war (and the long **Hutu-Tutsi conflict** in neighboring countries) is not, unfortunately alone. The **secession of South Sudan** from Sudan proper, the wars in what remains of that unhappy country, the secession of **Eritrea** from Ethiopia and the **rise of Christian-Muslim tension right across Africa** (where religious conflict often is fed by and intensifies “tribal”—in Europe we would say “ethnic” or “national”—conflicts) **are** strong **indications that** the **potential for** huge and destructive **conflict across Africa is very real**. But one must look beyond Africa. The Middle East of course is aflame in religious and ethnic conflict. The old British Raj including India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Burma and Sri Lanka offers countless examples of ethnic and religious conflict that sometimes is contained, and sometimes boils to the surface in horrendous acts of violence. Beyond that, rival nationalisms in East and Southeast Asia are keeping the world awake at night. The Congo war should be a reminder to us all that the foundations of our world are dynamite, and that the potential for new conflicts on the scale of the horrific wars of the 20th century is very much with us today. The second lesson from this conflict stems from the realization of how much patience and commitment from the international community (which in this case included the Atlantic democracies and a coalition of African states working as individual countries and through various international institutions) it has taken to get this far towards peace. Particularly at a time when many Americans want the US to turn inwards, there are people who make the argument that it is really none of America’s business to invest time and energy in the often thankless task of solving these conflicts. That might be an ugly but defensible position if we didn’t live in such a tinderbox world. Someone could rationally say, yes, it’s terrible that a million plus people are being killed overseas in a horrific conflict, but the war is really very far away and America has urgent needs at home and we should husband the resources we have available for foreign policy on things that have more power to affect us directly. The problem is that these wars spread. They may start in places that we don’t care much about (most Americans didn’t give a rat’s patootie about whether Germany controlled the Sudetenland in 1938 or Danzig in 1939) but they tend to spread to places that we do care very much about. This can be because a revisionist great power like Germany in 1938-39 needs to overturn the balance of power in Europe to achieve its goals, or it can be because instability in a very remote place triggers problems in places that we care about very much. Out of Afghanistan in 2001 came both 9/11 and the waves of insurgency and instability that threaten to rip nuclear-armed Pakistan apart or with trigger wider conflict India. Out of the mess in Syria a witches’ brew of terrorism and religious conflict looks set to complicate the security of our allies in Europe and the Middle East and even the security of the oil supply on which the world economy so profoundly depends. Africa, and the potential for upheaval there, is of more importance to American security than many people may understand. The line between Africa and the Middle East is a soft one. The weak states that straddle the southern approaches of the Sahara are ideal petri dishes for Al Qaeda type groups to form and attract local support. There are networks of funding and religious contact that give groups in these countries potential access to funds, fighters, training and weapons from the Middle East. A war in the eastern Congo might not directly trigger these other conflicts, but it helps to create the swirling underworld of arms trading, money transfers, illegal commerce and the rise of a generation of young men who become experienced fighters—and know no other way to make a living. It destabilizes the environment for neighboring states (like Uganda and Kenya) that play much more direct role in potential crises of greater concern to us.

#### 2] Forcing factory production results in unsafe manufacturing and forces trade-offs with medicines for other infectious diseases.

Szabo et. Al 21 Liz Szabo et. Al 21 [Liz Szabo (Liz Szabo, a senior correspondent and enterprise reporter who focuses on the quality of patient care, has covered medicine for two decades.)]. "Why Even Presidential Pressure Might Not Get More Vaccine to Market Faster." Kaiser Health News, 1-26-2021, Accessed 8-5-2021. https://khn.org/news/article/ramping-up-covid-vaccine-production-could-take-months-even-with-bidens-best-tool-to-pressure-companies/ // duongie

Americans are dying of covid-19 by the thousands, but efforts to ramp up production of potentially lifesaving vaccines are hitting a brick wall. Vaccine makers Moderna and Pfizer-BioNTech are **running their factories full ti**lt and are under enormous pressure to expand production or collaborate with other drug companies to set up additional assembly lines. That pressure is only growing as new viral variants of the virus threaten to launch the country into a deadlier phase of the pandemic. President Joe Biden has said he plans to invoke the Cold War-era authority of the Defense Production Act to provide more vaccines to millions of Americans. Consumer advocates — who had called for Donald Trump to use the Defense Production Act more aggressively as president — are now asking Biden to do the same. But even forcing companies to gear up production won’t **provide much-needed doses anytime soon**. Expanding production lines takes time. Establishing lines in repurposed facilities can take months. “The big problem is that even if you can get the raw material and get the infrastructure set up, how do you get a company that is already producing at maximum capacity to go beyond that maximum capacity?” said Lawrence Gostin, a professor of global health law at Georgetown University. Ordering the companies to work 24/7 “would be a naïve solution,” said Dr. Nicole Lurie, a senior adviser to the CEO of the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations, an international group that finances vaccines for emerging diseases. “They’re probably already doing that to the extent they have the raw materials.” Lurie added, “If you completely wear people out, mistakes happen. You **have to balance speed with quality and safety.”** The technological challenges involved are daunting, and the companies haven’t been forthcoming about what’s needed to overcome any supply shortfalls. “We don’t know what the holdup is. Is it capacity? Raw materials? People? Glass vials? We just don’t know what the bottleneck is,” said Erin Fox, senior director of drug information and support services at the University of Utah Health Hospitals. Forcing other companies to start making the vaccines might not work either, Gostin said. “I’m not sure if Biden could require a private company to transfer its technology to another company,” Gostin said. “That is highly questionable legally. … President Biden’s room for maneuvering isn’t as great as people think.” Drug companies define “trade secrets” broadly, Fox said. “In general, drug companies don’t have to tell me who is making their product, where it’s made, the location of the factory. … That’s considered proprietary.” Part of the challenge relates to how these vaccines are made. The first two authorized products use lipid nanoparticles to deliver a snippet of the coronavirus’s genetic material — called messenger RNA, or mRNA — into cells. The viral genes teach our cells how to make proteins that stimulate an immune response to the novel coronavirus. Messenger RNA is fragile and breaks down easily, so it needs to be handled with care, with specific temperatures and humidity levels. The vaccines “are not widgets,” said Lurie, who served as assistant secretary for preparedness and response at the Department of Health and Human Services during the Obama administration. Every step, experts say, to get vaccines to market has its complexities: obtaining raw materials; building facilities to precise specifications; buying single-use products, such as tubing and plastic bags to line stainless steel bioreactors; and hiring employees with the requisite training and expertise. Companies also must pass safety and quality inspections and arrange for transportation. The Defense Production Act, for instance, would allow the government to commandeer a plant that already has a fermenter — there are plenty in the biotech industry — to expand production. But that’s just the first stage in making an mRNA vaccine and, even then, it would take about a year to get going, said Dr. George Siber, a vaccine expert who is on the advisory board of CureVac, a German mRNA vaccine company. Companies would first have to do a breathtakingly thorough cleaning to prevent cross-contamination, Siber said. Next, they would need to set up, calibrate and test equipment, and train scientists and engineers to run it. Finally, Siber said, unlike a drug, whose components can be tested for purity, there’s no way to be sure a vaccine produced in a new facility is what it claims to be without testing it on animals and people. “Making vaccines is not like making cars, and quality control is paramount,” said Dr. Stanley Plotkin, a vaccine industry consultant credited with inventing the rubella vaccine. “We are expecting other vaccines in a matter of weeks, so it might be faster to bring them into use.” However, even that will require patience. Johnson & Johnson, expected to announce clinical trial results this month, has said that it won’t be able to deliver as many shots as planned because of manufacturing delays. The company did not confirm a manufacturing delay and declined to respond to questions. AstraZeneca’s vaccine, also funded in part by U.S. taxpayers, is in use already in the United Kingdom and India, but the Food and Drug Administration has raised questions about its late-stage trial, so it may not be available here until the spring. Novavax, another U.S.-funded vaccine maker, has been plagued by delays and only recently began recruiting volunteers for its big trial. Merck, the most recent company to get federal support for covid vaccines, announced Monday it was scrapping its two candidates after they failed to produce adequate immune response in early tests. “None of the vaccine makers are manufacturing at the volume they ultimately want to be at,” Lurie said. “They all have manufacturing delays.” Pfizer, which has committed 200 million doses to the U.S. government by the end of July, said last week it expected “no interruptions” in shipments from its primary U.S. covid manufacturing plant in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Pfizer spokesperson Sharon Castillo said the company has expanded manufacturing facilities and added more suppliers and contract manufacturers. Those efforts, and the company’s announcement that its five-dose vials actually contain an extra dose, mean “we can potentially deliver approximately 2 billion doses worldwide by the end of 2021.” The U.S. government also has an option to acquire another 400 million doses of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine, though the company declined to provide details on that option when asked. But countries around the world are competing for the same supplies and raw materials, Gostin said. Biden could use the Defense Production Act “to force Pfizer to prioritize U.S. contracts, but that would be politically risky,” given that other countries could retaliate by hoarding supplies. Although Pfizer is an American company, it has partnered with BioNTech, of Germany, to make its covid vaccine. “That would lead to a global mess.” Trying to corner the world market on vaccine ingredients or supplies would look bad, experts say, given that the United States just this week joined Covax, an international venture to source and distribute vaccines, in an effort to ensure poor countries aren’t left behind. Paradoxically, the rush to get vaccines to market may have resulted in a less efficient manufacturing process. Vaccine companies typically spend months making their factories run as efficiently as possible, as well as finding an ideal dose and the most effective interval between doses, Lurie said. Given the urgency of the pandemic, however, they delayed parts of this process and launched straight into mass production. Pfizer angered European countries last week when it paused vaccine production at a Belgian plant to upgrade its capacity. Pfizer said the weeklong closure would decrease vaccine deliveries to Europe for three to four weeks before boosting supplies in February. The move doesn’t affect U.S. vaccine supplies. “The U.S can’t necessarily readily access stuff that’s being held for vaccines in other countries,” Lurie said. And forcing other companies to make covid vaccines could jeopardize production of **other important shots,** such as measles, said Dr. Amesh Adalja, a senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security. Routine childhood immunization rates have fallen during the pandemic, raising the risk of epidemics. Using the act to prioritize covid vaccine manufacturing has already disrupted supplies of at least one drug, Fox noted. In December, Horizon Therapeutics warned doctors and patients to expect a shortage of a drug called Tepezza, used to treat thyroid-related eye disease, because its manufacturer was ordered to prioritize covid shots. Lawmakers and consumer advocates such as Public Citizen called on the government to use the Defense Production Act more aggressively. In a letter sent earlier this month, Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) and Rep. Katie Porter (D-Calif.) said Moderna should share its technique for stabilizing its vaccine at normal refrigerator temperatures, without “ultracold” freezers. Moderna officials have said the intrinsic differences in the two companies’ mRNA material make that technology hard to share. Besides, they say, Pfizer has declined to share data with Moderna. Pfizer has declined to comment on the issue. Since Moderna’s effort is federally funded, the government presumably has march-in rights and could take over production, said Mike Watson, former president of Moderna subsidiary Valera, in an email. “The reality is that however far you push production capacity, you sooner or later reach a bottleneck.” Experts say it’s not as simple as demanding that glassmaker Corning step up and make glass vials, for example. Of course, the vials will need to meet rigorous requirements. But there’s also this: The U.S. is facing a shortage of mined sand, the main component needed to make glass vials.

#### That turns the Case – limited care and medicine for other infectious diseases will go to white, privileged populations

#### 4] No US-China War – we assume rising tensions

Heath 17 Timothy Heath 4-30-2017 “U.S.-China Tensions Are Unlikely to Lead to War” <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/us-china-tensions-are-unlikely-lead-war-20411?page=2> (a senior international defense research analyst at the nonprofit, nonpartisan RAND Corporation and member of the Pardee RAND Graduate School faculty)//Elmer

* Checked

However, Allison ultimately fails to persuade because he fails to specify the political and strategic conditions that make war plausible in the first place. Allison’s analysis implies that the United States and China are in a situation analogous to that of the Soviet Union and the United States in the early 1960s. In the Cold War example, the two countries faced each other on a near-war footing and engaged in a bitter geostrategic and ideological struggle for supremacy. The two countries experienced a series of militarized crises and fought each other repeatedly through proxy wars. It was this broader context that made issues of misjudgment so dangerous in a crisis. By contrast, the U.S.-China relationship today operates at a much lower level of hostility and threat. China and the United States may be experiencing an increase in tensions, but the two countries remain far from the bitter, acrimonious rivalry that defined the U.S.-Soviet relationship in the early 1960s. Neither Washington nor Beijing regards the other as its principal enemy. Today’s rivals may view each other warily as competitors and threats on some issues, but they also view each other as important trade partners and partners on some shared concerns, such as North Korea, as the recent summit between President Donald Trump and Chinese president Xi Jinping illustrated. The behavior of their respective militaries underscores the relatively restrained rivalry. The military competition between China and the United States may be growing, but it operates at a far lower level of intensity than the relentless arms racing that typified the U.S.-Soviet standoff. And unlike their Cold War counterparts, U.S. and Chinese militaries are not postured to fight each other in major wars. Moreover, polls show that the people of the two countries regard each other with mixed views—a considerable contrast from the hostile sentiment expressed by the U.S. and Soviet publics for each other. Lacking both preparations for major war and a constituency for conflict, leaders and bureaucracies in both countries have less incentive to misjudge crisis situations in favor of unwarranted escalation. To the contrary, political leaders and bureaucracies currently face a strong incentive to find ways of defusing crises in a manner that avoids unwanted escalation.

#### 5] China’s not revisionist – your I/L gets the R/C of aggression reversed

Prueher 16 Joseph Prueher 12-12-2016 “How America Can Lead in Asia” <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/how-america-can-lead-asia-18720?nopaging=1,%2520Accessed%252012-15-2016> (former career U.S. Naval officer, having served as Commander of the Pacific Command, along with J. Stapleton Roy who is a former senior career U.S. diplomat specializing in Asian affairs, Paul Heer who is a former career U.S. intelligence official who served as National Intelligence Officer for East Asia, David M. Lampton who is Professor and Director of China Studies at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, Michael D. Swaine who is a career policy analyst specializing in Asian security issues, especially those involving the U.S.-China relationship, and Ezra Vogel who is Henry Ford II Professor of the Social Sciences Emeritus at Harvard University)//Elmer

* Checked

In the security realm, for the first time in modern history, China is developing military capabilities that significantly improve its ability to defend its interests within at least the “first island chain” that extends from Japan through Taiwan and the Philippines to continental Southeast Asia. This represents a challenge to traditional U.S. air and sea superiority in the western Pacific, a status that the United States has enjoyed since the end of World War II. In particular, China’s growing military capabilities directly impact U.S. defense alliances with Japan, the Republic of Korea and the Philippines, and U.S. security commitments with respect to Taiwan. While China’s growing military capabilities and ambitions certainly create challenges for the United States, they do not necessarily reflect aggressive or expansionist intentions and instead derive largely from Beijing’s difficult security environment and historical experience. China has land borders with fourteen countries, some small and inconsequential but others, like Russia and India, wielding significant power and resources. Four of these neighbors have nuclear weapons, and the United States has a nuclear umbrella over Japan and South Korea. China's “near abroad” also includes major countries such as Indonesia and Iran. While China can develop formidable naval capabilities along its coastal areas, it lacks unfettered access to the open seas, whether the Pacific, Indian, or Arctic Oceans. It does not control the island chains on its eastern flanks, and narrow straits restrict its naval access to the Indian Ocean. In this sense, anti-access and area denial, a concept often applied to China’s military strategy along its maritime periphery, can also work against it. Modern history has not been kind to China. It lost vast swathes of its territory because of its earlier weakness, and it lagged behind Japan in modernization. In the 19th and 20th centuries, multiple wars were fought inside China or on its borders. In addition, vast sweeps of China's western regions are occupied by ethnic minorities, such as the Tibetans and the Uighurs in Xinjiang, living in their historic homelands. These regions are vulnerable to separatist sentiments, which reinforces the importance China attaches to preserving national unity and territorial integrity. Understandably, the Chinese believe that over the last two hundred years they have been bullied and victimized by stronger powers. They are determined not to let this happen again, and genuinely believe their own rhetoric that their goal is not to dominate but to avoid being dominated. Their neighbors, not surprisingly, are skeptical of this claim. Moreover, the Chinese may be poor judges of their own future behavior since their military modernization gives them growing capabilities to bully weaker countries around their periphery.

### Advantage 2

#### The Plan can’t solve COVID -

#### 1] Lack of key supplies

Tepper 21 James Tepper, 4/10 [James Tepper, (James M. Tepper is an American neuroscientist currently a Board of Governors Professor of Molecular and Behavioral Neuroscience and Distinguished Professor at Rutgers University and an Elected Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.)]. "Global Covid vaccine rollout threatened by shortage of vital components." Guardian, 4-1-2021, Accessed 8-8-2021. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/10/global-covid-vaccine-rollout-threatened-by-shortage-of-vital-components // duongie

Vaccine-makers around the world face shortages of vital components including large plastic growbags, according to the head of the firm that is manufacturing a quarter of the UK’s jab supply. Stan Erck, the chief executive of Novavax – which makes the second vaccine to be grown and bottled entirely in Britain – told the Observer that the shortage of 2,000-litre bags in which the vaccine cells were grown was a significant hurdle for global supply. His warning came as bag manufacturers revealed that some pharmaceutical firms were waiting up to 12 months for the sterile single-use disposable plastic containers, which are used to make medicines of all kinds, including the Pfizer, Moderna and Novavax Covid-19 vaccines. But Erck and his British partners said they were confident they had enough suppliers to avoid disruption to the supply of Novavax. The vaccine is waiting for approval from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) but the first of 60 million doses ordered by the government are already in production in Teesside. The Fujifilm Diosynth Biotechnologies factory began growing the first cells for the Novavax vaccine in Billingham, County Durham this month and in a few weeks they will fill the bioreactor bag, ready to be transported to GlaxoSmithKline’s plant at Barnard Castle to be put into vials for distribution. “The first hurdle is showing it works and we don’t have that hurdle any more,” Erck said. But he added there were others still to overcome. “There’s the media that the cells have to grow in,” Erck said. “You grow them in these 2,000-litre bags, which are in short supply. Then you pour it out and you have to filter it, and the filters are in short supply. The little things count.” Novavax almost ran out of bags at one of its 20 factories earlier this year, but there had been no delays for the UK operation, according to Martin Meeson, global chief executive of Fujifilm Diosynth. “We started working on our part of the supply chain in summer last year,” he said. “We had to accelerate some of the investment here, but the commitment we made last summer to start manufacturing in February has been fulfilled.” Production of coronavirus vaccines is being ramped up. Production of coronavirus vaccines is being ramped up. Photograph: Christophe Archambault/AP Both Meeson and Erck said the UK’s vaccine taskforce had been helpful in sorting out supply issues so far, but other countries and other medical supplies might be affected. ABEC makes bioreactor bags at two plants in the US and two in Fermoy and Kells in Ireland, and delivered six 4,000-litre bags to the Serum Institute in India last year for its Covid vaccines. Brady Cole, vice-president of equipment solutions at ABEC, said: “We are hearing from our customer base of lead times that are pushing out to nine, 10, even 12 months to get bioreactor bags. We typically run out at 16 weeks to get a custom bioreactor bag out to a customer.” He said ABEC was still managing to fulfil orders at roughly that rate. “The bag manufacturing capacity can’t meet demand right now,” he added. “And on the component side, the tubes and the instruments and so forth that also go into the bag assembly – those lead times are also starting to get stretched as well. But the biggest problem we see is it really is just the ability to get bags in a reasonable amount of time.” ABEC expanded its factories last year and has now started making 6,000-litre bags, which are roughly the size of a minibus. Other firms including MilliporeSigma, part of German company Merck, have also been expanding their manufacturing facilities. American firm Thermo Fisher Scientific expects it will finish doubling its capacity this year. The US government has also blocked exports of bags, filters and other components so it can supply more Pfizer vaccines for Americans. Adar Poonawalla, the chief executive of the Serum Institute of India, said the restrictions were likely to cause serious bottlenecks. Novavax is hoping to avoid delays and “vaccine nationalism” by operating on four continents, with 20 facilities in nine countries. “One year ago, we had exactly zero manufacturing capacity,” Erck said. “We’re self-sufficient. The two main things we need to do are done in the UK. And in the EU we have plants in Spain and the Czech Republic and fill-and-finish in Germany and the Netherlands.” There was no need for vaccines to cross borders to fulfil contracts, he said. The Oxford/AstraZeneca vaccine was hit by a delay to a delivery of 5 million doses from India and a problem with a batch made in Britain, and the company has been dragged into a lengthy row between the UK and the EU over vaccine exports.

#### 2] Hurts Innovation

**Value Ingenuity 20** [Value Ingenuity, (The Value Ingenuity project is telling the story of innovation, its roots, its impact, its social and moral imperatives, and the public policy prescriptions that will assure a continued upward trajectory for the generations to follow. Our objective is to advance globally a shared purpose of mutual investment in sustainable innovation.)]. "WTO IP Waiver Would Undermine Covid Innovation." 10-2-2020, Accessed 8-5-2021. https://www.valueingenuity.com/2021/05/18/wto-ip-waiver-would-undermine-covid-innovation/ // duongie

A TRIPS waiver for vaccines would do nothing to help — and could in fact hurt — the effort to produce billions of vaccine doses and get them in arms. Supply of these high-tech products is ramping up quickly, with about 10 billion doses projected to be produced by the end of 2021 — we shouldn’t distract attention away from that all-important goal. IP is not a barrier to vaccine access. It already enabled the creation of three vaccines, in record-breaking time, that have received FDA authorization. IP is also safely facilitating international partnerships (275+ to date) to share technology and information more easily with trusted partners across borders. An IP waiver could lead to untested and unregulated copycats. Some nations are looking to manufacture sophisticated vaccines without permission, exacerbating the shortage of the critical materials (raw materials, tubing, vials etc.) and increasing vaccine hesitancy due to the development of unsafe products and medicines. The proposal jeopardizes U.S. manufacturing & jobs. Allowing other countries to take and commercialize American-made technologies conflicts with President Biden’s goal to build up American infrastructure and create manufacturing jobs. In the U.S. alone, biopharmaceutical companies support 4 million jobs across all 50 states, with many more across innovation ecosystems in labs, finance, and SMEs. Waiving IP undermines America’s leadership in the life sciences. We should not be forfeiting IP to countries looking to undermine America’s global leadership in biomedical technology and innovation. IP protections enabled decades of R&D by biopharmaceutical research companies, allowing them to move quickly and effectively against COVID-19. Business welcomes the Biden Administration’s support for the global vaccine program, COVAX. This type of program can have a significant positive, practical impact on global rollout of vaccines and therapies without disrupting the incredible IP-enabled progress that has been made to date to defeat the pandemic. Its effects will be even more effective as trade barriers are removed and all countries allow vaccines to be exported internationally. GOOD TO KNOW: Today 57% of all new medicines globally come from the United States with its world-class IP ecosystem, and private companies in the life sciences community make up more than 80% of the investment in the research and development of those new drugs. The U.S. biopharmaceutical industry directly and indirectly supports over 4 million American jobs. SCIENTISTS, ACADEMICS, ADVOCATES AND POLITICAL LEADERS SKEPTICAL OF WAIVING IP RIGHTS “The goal is noble, but the demand [for an IP waiver] is more slogan than solution … patents on vaccines are not the central bottleneck, and even if turned over to other nations, would not quickly result in more shots. This is because vaccine manufacturing is exacting and time-consuming. Look at the production difficulties encountered by Emergent BioSolutions, a vaccine manufacturer in Baltimore, where 15 million doses were contaminated. That was caught before the shots were distributed, but one can imagine the horrific consequences of a failure to maintain quality control elsewhere in the world.” WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL BOARD, May 4, 2021 “The goal is noble, but the demand [for an IP waiver] is more slogan than solution … patents on vaccines are not the central bottleneck, and even if turned over to other nations, would not quickly result in more shots. This is because vaccine manufacturing is exacting and time-consuming. Look at the production difficulties encountered by Emergent BioSolutions, a vaccine manufacturer in Baltimore, where 15 million doses were contaminated. That was caught before the shots were distributed, but one can imagine the horrific consequences of a failure to maintain quality control elsewhere in the world.” WALL STREET JOURNAL EDITORIAL BOARD, May 6, 2021 “The U.S. decision to support a temporary waiver of intellectual-property protections for Covid-19 vaccines won’t end debate on the issue, much less end the pandemic. Reaching a formal agreement could take months and even then may not accelerate vaccine production; opposition from countries such as Germany could yet doom any compromise.” BLOOMBERG EDITORIAL BOARD, May 12, 2021 “The collaboration that’s happened in the midst of this pandemic I think points to the ways in which IP has actually not been a barrier, but a facilitator of critical, cutting-edge innovation […] I don’t think that waiving IP rights will suddenly enable other countries to ramp up the manufacturing of complex vaccines.” SEN. CHRIS COONS (D-DE), CSIS: April 22, 2021 “There are only so many vaccine manufacturers in the world […] people are very careful about the safety of vaccines […] The thing that is holding us back is not IP. There is no idle factory with regulatory approval that makes magically safe vaccines […] we have all the rights from the vaccine companies and the work is going at full speed” BILL GATES, Sky News: April 25, 2021 “There are enough manufacturers, it just takes time to scale up. And by the way, I have been blown away by the cooperation between the public and private sectors in the last year, in developing these vaccines.” ADAR POONAWALLA, CEO SERUM INSTITUTE OF INDIA, February 14, 2021 “These [vaccines] are complex to make so just waiving IP and patents isn’t going to help […] you can only get trade secrets and knowhow with the cooperation of the originator companies, and they don’t have the bandwidth to do this in every part of the world … the only immediate solution is for rich countries to donate or sell their surplus vaccine to COVAX or other countries.” JAYASHREE WATAL, GEORGETOWN LAW PROFESSOR & FORMER WTO IP COUNSELOR, April 22, 2021 “It is also unclear whether a waiver of IP rights will make a difference […] Furthermore, as others have pointed out, IP rights are only a piece of what is needed to produce vaccines. There is currently a global shortage of raw materials and proper manufacturing facilities.” SAPAN KUMAR, LAW FOUNDATION PROFESSOR OF LAW AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LAW CENTER, May 9, 2021 “This is technology that’s every bit as critical as munitions and encryption codes […] It’s a platform technology that can be used to make all manner of treatments going forward, including vaccines.” DAVID KAPPOS, FORMER U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE FOR PRESIDENT OBAMA, April 22, 2021 “The notion that we would then turn around and go to the World Trade Organization and basically endorse a policy of DARPA-funded technology transfer to China is just inconceivable. You’re basically aiding and abetting China’s ‘Made in China 2025’ plans for technological dominance.” CLETE WILLEMS, FORMER SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE, INVESTMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT, April 22, 2021.

#### 3] Disease doesn’t cause extinction

Adalja 16 [Amesh Adalja is an infectious-disease physician at the University of Pittsburgh. Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race? June 17, 2016. https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/]

But when people ask me if I’m worried about infectious diseases, they’re often not asking about the threat to human lives; they’re asking about the threat to human life. With each outbreak of a headline-grabbing emerging infectious disease comes a fear of extinction itself. The fear envisions a large proportion of humans succumbing to infection, leaving no survivors or so few that the species can’t be sustained.

I’m not afraid of this apocalyptic scenario, but I do understand the impulse. Worry about the end is a quintessentially human trait. Thankfully, so is our resilience.

For most of mankind’s history, infectious diseases were the existential threat to humanity—and for good reason. They were quite successful at killing people: The 6th century’s Plague of Justinian knocked out an estimated 17 percent of the world’s population; the 14th century Black Death decimated a third of Europe; the 1918 influenza pandemic killed 5 percent of the world; malaria is estimated to have killed half of all humans who have ever lived.

Any yet, of course, humanity continued to flourish. Our species’ recent explosion in lifespan is almost exclusively the result of the control of infectious diseases through sanitation, vaccination, and antimicrobial therapies. Only in the modern era, in which many infectious diseases have been tamed in the industrial world, do people have the luxury of death from cancer, heart disease, or stroke in the 8th decade of life. Childhoods are free from watching siblings and friends die from outbreaks of typhoid, scarlet fever, smallpox, measles, and the like.

So what would it take for a disease to wipe out humanity now?

In Michael Crichton’s The Andromeda Strain, the canonical book in the disease-outbreak genre, an alien microbe threatens the human race with extinction, and humanity’s best minds are marshaled to combat the enemy organism. Fortunately, outside of fiction, there’s no reason to expect alien pathogens to wage war on the human race any time soon, and my analysis suggests that any real-life domestic microbe reaching an extinction level of threat probably is just as unlikely.

Any apocalyptic pathogen would need to possess a very special combination of two attributes. First, it would have to be so unfamiliar that no existing therapy or vaccine could be applied to it. Second, it would need to have a high and surreptitious transmissibility before symptoms occur. The first is essential because any microbe from a known class of pathogens would, by definition, have family members that could serve as models for containment and countermeasures. The second would allow the hypothetical disease to spread without being detected by even the most astute clinicians.

The three infectious diseases most likely to be considered extinction-level threats in the world today—influenza, HIV, and Ebola—don’t meet these two requirements. Influenza, for instance, despite its well-established ability to kill on a large scale, its contagiousness, and its unrivaled ability to shift and drift away from our vaccines, is still what I would call a “known unknown.” While there are many mysteries about how new flu strains emerge, from at least the time of Hippocrates, humans have been attuned to its risk. And in the modern era, a full-fledged industry of influenza preparedness exists, with effective vaccine strategies and antiviral therapies.

HIV, which has killed 39 million people over several decades, is similarly limited due to several factors. Most importantly, HIV’s dependency on blood and body fluid for transmission (similar to Ebola) requires intimate human-to-human contact, which limits contagion. Highly potent antiviral therapy allows most people to live normally with the disease, and a substantial group of the population has genetic mutations that render them impervious to infection in the first place. Lastly, simple prevention strategies such as needle exchange for injection drug users and barrier contraceptives—when available—can curtail transmission risk.

Ebola, for many of the same reasons as HIV as well as several others, also falls short of the mark. This is especially due to the fact that it spreads almost exclusively through people with easily recognizable symptoms, plus the taming of its once unfathomable 90 percent mortality rate by simple supportive care.

Beyond those three, every other known disease falls short of what seems required to wipe out humans—which is, of course, why we’re still here. And it’s not that diseases are ineffective. On the contrary, diseases’ failure to knock us out is a testament to just how resilient humans are. Part of our evolutionary heritage is our immune system, one of the most complex on the planet, even without the benefit of vaccines or the helping hand of antimicrobial drugs. This system, when viewed at a species level, can adapt to almost any enemy imaginable. Coupled to genetic variations amongst humans—which open up the possibility for a range of advantages, from imperviousness to infection to a tendency for mild symptoms—this adaptability ensures that almost any infectious disease onslaught will leave a large proportion of the population alive to rebuild, in contrast to the fictional Hollywood versions.

#### 4] No extinction from pandemics

* Death rates as high as 50% didn’t collapse civilization
* Fossil fuel record caps risk at .1% per century
* health, sanitation, medicine, science, public health bodies, solve
* viruses can’t survive in all locations
* refugee populations like tribes, remote researchers, submarine crews, solve

Ord 20 Ord, Toby. Toby David Godfrey Ord (born 18 July 1979) is an Australian philosopher. He founded Giving What We Can, an international society whose members pledge to donate at least 10% of their income to effective charities and is a key figure in the effective altruism movement, which promotes using reason and evidence to help the lives of others as much as possible.[3] He is a Senior Research Fellow at the University of Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, where his work is focused on existential risk. BA in Phil and Comp Sci from Melbourne, BPhil in Phil from Oxford, PhD in Phil from Oxford. The precipice: existential risk and the future of humanity. Hachette Books, 2020.

Are we safe now from events like this? Or are we more vulnerable? Could a pandemic threaten humanity’s future?10 The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In 541 CE the Plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine Empire. Over three years it took the lives of roughly 3 percent of the world’s people.11 When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of exchange, through diseases such as measles, influenza and especially smallpox. During the next hundred years a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll—one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the loss of more than 90 percent of the population of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower.12 And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. As a rough upper bound, the Columbian exchange may have killed as many as 10 percent of the world’s people.13 Centuries later, the world had become so interconnected that a truly global pandemic was possible. Near the end of the First World War, a devastating strain of influenza (known as the 1918 flu or Spanish Flu) spread to six continents, and even remote Pacific islands. At least a third of the world’s population were infected and 3 to 6 percent were killed.14 This death toll outstripped that of the First World War, and possibly both World Wars combined. Yet even events like these fall short of being a threat to humanity’s longterm potential.15 In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilization in the affected areas falter, but recover. The regional 25 to 50 percent death rate was not enough to precipitate a continent-wide collapse of civilization. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have altered the course of history substantially, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilization is likely to make it through future events with similar death rates, even if they were global in scale. The 1918 flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development despite its global reach. It looks like it was lost in the wake of the First World War, which despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history.16 It is less clear what lesson to draw from the Columbian exchange due to our lack of good records and its mix of causes. Pandemics were clearly a part of what led to a regional collapse of civilization, but we don’t know whether this would have occurred had it not been for the accompanying violence and imperial rule. The strongest case against existential risk from natural pandemics is the fossil record argument from Chapter 3. Extinction risk from natural causes above 0.1 percent per century is incompatible with the evidence of how long humanity and similar species have lasted. But this argument only works where the risk to humanity now is similar or lower than the longterm levels. For most risks this is clearly true, but not for pandemics. We have done many things to exacerbate the risk: some that could make pandemics more likely to occur, and some that could increase their damage. Thus even “natural” pandemics should be seen as a partly anthropogenic risk. Our population now is a thousand times greater than over most of human history, so there are vastly more opportunities for new human diseases to originate.17 And our farming practices have created vast numbers of animals living in unhealthy conditions within close proximity to humans. This increases the risk, as many major diseases originate in animals before crossing over to humans. Examples include HIV (chimpanzees), Ebola (bats), SARS (probably bats) and influenza (usually pigs or birds).18 Evidence suggests that diseases are crossing over into human populations from animals at an increasing rate.19 Modern civilization may also make it much easier for a pandemic to spread. The higher density of people living together in cities increases the number of people each of us may infect. Rapid long-distance transport greatly increases the distance pathogens can spread, reducing the degrees of separation between any two people. Moreover, we are no longer divided into isolated populations as we were for most of the last 10,000 years.20 Together these effects suggest that we might expect more new pandemics, for them to spread more quickly, and to reach a higher percentage of the world’s people. But we have also changed the world in ways that offer protection. We have a healthier population; improved sanitation and hygiene; preventative and curative medicine; and a scientific understanding of disease. Perhaps most importantly, we have public health bodies to facilitate global communication and coordination in the face of new outbreaks. We have seen the benefits of this protection through the dramatic decline of endemic infectious disease over the last century (though we can’t be sure pandemics will obey the same trend). Finally, we have spread to a range of locations and environments unprecedented for any mammalian species. This offers special protection from extinction events, because it requires the pathogen to be able to flourish in a vast range of environments and to reach exceptionally isolated populations such as uncontacted tribes, Antarctic researchers and nuclear submarine crews. 21 It is hard to know whether these combined effects have increased or decreased the existential risk from pandemics. This uncertainty is ultimately bad news: we were previously sitting on a powerful argument that the risk was tiny; now we are not. But note that we are not merely interested in the direction of the change, but also in the size of the change. If we take the fossil record as evidence that the risk was less than one in 2,000 per century, then to reach 1 percent per century the pandemic risk would need to be at least 20 times larger. This seems unlikely. In my view, the fossil record still provides a strong case against there being a high extinction risk from “natural” pandemics. So most of the remaining existential risk would come from the threat of permanent collapse: a pandemic severe enough to collapse civilization globally, combined with civilization turning out to be hard to re-establish or bad luck in our attempts to do so.