# ROB

#### The counter role of the ballot is to evaluate consequences

#### Morality must be rooted in consequences. Thus, the standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### 1. Value is only accessible through experience. Harris 10:

Sam Harris, CEO Project Reason; PHD UCLA Neuroscience; BA Stanford Philosophy, “ The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values”) OS

Here is my (consequentialist) starting point: all questions of value (right and wrong, good and evil, etc.) depend upon the possibility of experiencing such value. Without potential consequences at the level of experience—happiness, suffering, joy, despair, etc.—all talk of value is empty. Therefore, to say that an act is morally necessary, or evil, or blameless, is to make (tacit) claims about its consequences in the lives of conscious creatures (whether actual or potential). I am unaware of any interesting exception to this rule. Needless to say, if one is worried about pleasing God or His angels, this assumes that such invisible entities are conscious (in some sense) and cognizant of human behavior. It also generally assumes and that it is possible to suffer their wrath or enjoy their approval, either in this world or the world to come. Even within religion, therefore, consequences and conscious states remain the foundation of all values.

#### 2. Prefer additionally – Death must be the primary concern of an ethical theory since it destroys the subject itself. Paterson 03:

Craig Paterson – Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics, 2003.

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81  In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human

#### 3. governments must use util – scarcity of resources proves that aggregation is necessary and possible.

**Mack 4** [Peter, MBBS, FRCS(Ed), FRCS (Glasg), PhD, MBA, MHlthEcon] “Utilitarian Ethics in Healthcare.” International Journal of the Computer, the Internet, and Management Vol. 12, No.3. 2004. Department of Surgery. Singapore General Hospital.

Medicine is a costly science, but of greater concern to the health economist is that it is also a limitless art. Every medical advance created new needs that did not exist until the means of meeting them came into existence. Physicians are reputed to have an infinite capacity to do ever more things, and perform ever more expensive interventions for their patients so long as any of their patients’ health needs remain unfulfilled. **The traditional stance of the physician is that each patient is an isolated universe**. When confronted with a situation in which his duty involves a competition for scarce medications or treatments, he would plead the patient’s cause by all methods, short of deceit. However, **when the physician’s decision involves more than just his own patient, or has some commitment to public health, other issues have to be considered. He then has to recognise that the unbridled advocacy of the patient may not square with what the economist perceives to be the most advantageous policy to society as a whole.** Medical professionals characteristically deplore scarcities. Many of them are simply not prepared to modify their intransigent principle of unwavering duty to their patients’ individual interest. However, **in decisions involving multiple patients, making available more medication, labour or expenses for one patient will mean leaving less for another. The physician is then compelled by his competing loyalties to enter into a decision mode of one versus many, where the underlying constraint is one of finiteness of the commodities.** Although the medical treatment may be simple and inexpensive in many instances, there are situations such as in renal dialysis, where prioritisation of treatment poses a moral dilemma because some patients will be denied the treatment and perish. Ethics and economics share areas of overlap. They both deal with how people should behave, what policies the state should pursue and what obligations citizens owe to their governments. The centrality of the human person in both normative economics and normative ethics is pertinent to this discussion. Economics is the study of human action in the marketplace whereas ethics deals with the “rightness” or “wrongness” of human action in general. Both disciplines are rooted in human reason and human nature and the two disciplines intersect at the human person and the analysis of human action. From the economist’s perspective, ethics is identified with the investigation of rationally justifiable bases for resolving conflict among persons with divergent aims and who share a common world. **Because of the scarcity of resources, one’s success is another person’s failure. Therefore ethics search for rationally justifiable standards for the resolution of interpersonal conflict. While the realities of human life have given rise to the concepts of property, justice and scarcity, the management of scarcity requires the exercise of choice**, since having more of some goods means having less of others. Exercising choice in turn involves comparisons, and comparisons are based on principles. As ethicists, the meaning of these principles must be sought in the moral basis that implementing them would require. For instance, if the implementation of distributive justice in healthcare is founded on the basis of welfare-based principles, as opposed to say resource-based principles, it means that the health system is motivated by the idea that what is of primary moral importance is the level of welfare of the people. This means that **all distributive questions should be settled according to which distribution maximises welfare.** Utilitarianism is fundamentally welfarist in its philosophy. Application of the principle to healthcare requires a prior understanding of the welfarist theory as expounded by the economist. Conceptually, welfarist theory is built on four tenets: utility maximisation, consumer sovereignty, consequentialism and welfarism. Utility maximisation embodies the behavioural proposition that individuals choose rationally, but it does not address the morality of rational choice. Consumer sovereignty is the maxim that individuals are the best judge of their own welfare. Consequentialism holds that any action or choice must be judged exclusively in terms of outcomes. Welfarism is the proposition that the “goodness” of the resource allocation be judged solely on the welfare or utility levels in that situation. **Taken together these four tenets require that a policy be judged solely in terms of the resulting utilities achieved by individuals as assessed by the individuals themselves. Issues of who receives the utility, the source of the utility and any non-utility aspects of the situation are ignored.**

### DA: Innovation

#### Reducing IP protections destroys relationships between public and private sector—Biden administration proves.

**Jennings '21** (Katie Jennings; staff writer at Forbes, healthcare reporter for POLITICO, Knight-Bagehot Fellow in reporting; 5-5-2021; "Biden Decision To Back Waiving Patents For Covid Vaccines Sparks Industry Backlash"; https://www.forbes.com/sites/katiejennings/2021/05/05/biden-decision-to-back-waiving-patents-for-covid-vaccines-sparks-industry-backlash/, Forbes, accessed 7-29-2021; JPark)

The U.S. is typically the staunchest defender of intellectual property rights on the international stage, so it was something of a shock when **the Biden Administration** on Wednesday **announced its support for waiving patents on Covid-19 vaccines**. “This is a global health crisis, and the extraordinary circumstances of the Covid-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures,” U.S. Trade Representative Katherine Tai said in a statement. “The Administration believes strongly in intellectual property protections, but in service of ending this pandemic, supports the waiver of those protections for Covid-19 vaccines.” The move comes in response to a World Trade Organization proposal led by India and South Africa to suspend some provisions of an international trade agreement in a bid to boost vaccine manufacturing and access, especially in lower- and middle-income countries. But it remains unclear how quickly production could increase, as patents are only one constraint in a complex global supply chain. The pharmaceutical industry was quick to respond, noting that drug manufacturers are already working with governments and nonprofits to provide access to vaccines. Trade groups warned that waiving intellectual property protections would slow down innovation while doing little to actually help meet demand. “**This change in longstanding American policy will not save lives. It** also flies in the face of President Biden’s stated policy of building up American infrastructure and creating jobsby **hand**ing **over American innovations to countries looking to undermine our leadership in biomedical discovery,”** Steve Ubl, **president and CEO of the trade group PhRMA said in a statement**. **“This decision does nothing** to address the real challenges to getting more shots in arms, including last-mile distribution and limited availability of raw materials.”

#### **Backlash from Big Pharma will manifest in widespread innovation loss**

Lazare and Guerrero 21 [Sarah, editor and reporter, journalist, In These Times, "Big Pharma Is Deciding Who Lives and Who Dies in the Global South The chilling effect of the pharmaceutical industry’s veiled threats." July 22, <https://inthesetimes.com/article/pfizer-pharmaceutical-companies-covid-pandemic-coronavirus-latin-america-trips-waiver-vaccines>

On April 24, Elizabeth de Carvalhaes, executive president of the Brazilian pharmaceutical company trade group Interfarma, said out loud what the drug industry had up until then avoided uttering in public. In an interview with Folha de São Paulo, the most widely-read newspaper in Brazil, de Carvalhaes declared that if the South American country were to green-light compulsory licensing to expand access to Covid-19 vaccines, pharmaceutical companies might respond by withholding supply of the vaccines. ​“This is not retaliation,” she proclaimed. ​“The demand is much bigger than the supply, and they may find it more advantageous from an economic point of view to sell to countries that do not break patents**.”** This was not an idle threat. Interfarma represents Pfizer, Gilead, AstraZeneca and other major pharmaceutical companies. The trade group’s spokesperson made the remarks at a time when Brazil was pushed to the point of desperation: The same day the article was published, more than 71,000 new Covid-19 cases were reported in Brazil. The country’s outbreak has been so severe and uncontrolled that it’s spawned the Gamma variant, which has since spread around the world. Some countries hope to find relief in compulsory licensing, when a government allows the production of a vaccine without the consent of a patent owner, a move floated in Brazil as a way to urgently expand vaccine access while the pandemic rages. (A compulsory licensing bill has passed Brazil’s Senate but has not yet officially been signed into law.) Interfarma’s implied threat against such a measure underscores a dynamic that public health advocates say is particularly pernicious during a pandemic: Countries that run afoul of drug companies by supporting measures to override patents risk facing the wrath of an industry that has the power to decide whether a huge swath of their population lives or dies**.**

#### Innovation is crucial to solving bioterror

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

As key actors in the healthcare innovation landscape, pharmaceutical and life sci-ences companies have been called on to develop medicines, vaccines and diagnostics for pressing **public health challenges.** The COVID-19 crisis is one such challenge, but there are many others. For example, MERS, SARS, Ebola, Zika and avian and swine flu are also infectious diseases that represent public health threats. **Infectious agents such as anthrax, smallpox** and tularemia **could present threats in a bioterrorism con-text**.1 The **general threat** to public health that is **posed by antimicrobial resistance is also well-recognised** as an area in need of pharmaceutical innovation.

Innovating in response to these challenges does not always align well with pharmaceutical industry commercial models, shareholder expectations and compe-tition within the industry. However, the expertise, networks and infrastructure that industry has within its reach, as well as public expectations and the moral imperative, make pharmaceutical companies and the wider life sciences sector an **indispensable partner in the search for solutions that save lives.**

This perspective argues for the need to establish more sustainable and scalable ways of incentivising pharmaceu-tical innovation in response to infectious disease threats to public health. It considers both past and current examples of efforts to mobilise pharmaceutical innovation in high commercial risk areas, including in the context of current efforts to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic.

In global pandemic crises like COVID-19, the urgency and scale of the crisis – as well as the spotlight placed on pharmaceutical companies – mean that contributing to the search for effective medicines, vaccines or diagnostics is essential for socially responsible companies in the sec-tor.2 It is therefore unsurprising that we are seeing indus-try-wide efforts unfold at unprecedented scale and pace. Whereas there is always scope for more activity, industry is currently contributing in a variety of ways. Examples include pharmaceutical companies donating existing com-pounds to assess their utility in the fight against COVID-19;  screening existing compound libraries in-house or with partners to see if they can be repurposed; accelerating tri-als for potentially effective medicine or vaccine candidates; and in some cases rapidly accelerating in-house research and development to discover new treatments or vaccine agents and develop diagnostics tests.3,4 Pharmaceutical companies are collaborating with each other in some of these efforts **and participating in global R&D partnerships** (such as the Innovative Medicines Initiative effort to accel-erate the development of potential therapies for COVID-19) and supporting national efforts to expand diagnosis and testing capacity and **ensure affordable and ready access to potential solutions**.3,5,6

The primary purpose of such innovation is to benefit patients and wider population health. Although there are also reputational benefits from involvement that can be realised across the industry, there are likely to be rela-tively few companies that are ‘commercial’ winners. Those who might gain substantial revenues will be under pres-sure not to be seen as profiting from the pandemic. In the United Kingdom for example, GSK has stated that it does not expect to profit from its COVID-19 related activities and that any gains will be invested in supporting research and long-term pandemic preparedness, as well as in developing products that would be affordable in the world’s poorest countries.7 Similarly, in the United States AbbVie has waived intellectual property rights for an existing com-bination product that is being tested for therapeutic poten-tial against COVID-19, which would support affordability and allow for a supply of generics.8,9 Johnson & Johnson has stated that its potential vaccine – which is expected to begin trials – will be available on a not-for-profit basis during the pandemic.10

Pharma is mobilising substantial efforts to rise to the COVID-19 challenge at hand. However, we need to consider how pharmaceutical innovation for responding to emerging infectious diseases can best be enabled beyond the current crisis. Many public health threats (including those associated with other infectious diseases, **bioterror-ism agents and antimicrobial resistance)** are **urgently in need of pharma**ceutical **innovation**, even if their impacts are not as visible to society as COVID-19 is in the imme-diate term. The pharmaceutical industry has responded to previous public health emergencies associated with infec-tious disease in recent times – for example those associated with Ebola and Zika outbreaks.11 However, it has done so to a lesser scale than for COVID-19 and with contribu-tions from fewer companies. Similarly, levels of activity in response to the threat of antimicrobial resistance are still low.12 There are important policy questions as to whether – and how – industry could engage with such public health threats to an even greater extent under improved innova-tion conditions.

#### Bioweapons cause extinction – next gen gene-editing guarantees extinction and governments have the tech, it’s only a question of whether they deploy it, but single instances of weaponization cause bioterror that escalates even if states never use the weapon

Griffin 16 [Matthew Griffin, described as “The Adviser behind the Advisers” and a “Young Kurzweil,” is the founder and CEO of the World Futures Forum and the 311 Institute, a global Futures and Deep Futures consultancy working between the dates of 2020 to 2070, and is an award winning futurist, and author of “Codex of the Future” series. Regularly featured in the global media, including AP, BBC, CNBC, Discovery, RT, and Viacom, Matthew’s ability to identify, track, and explain the impacts of hundreds of revolutionary emerging technologies on global culture, industry and society, is unparalleled. Recognised for the past six years as one of the world’s foremost futurists, innovation and strategy experts Matthew is an international speaker who helps governments, investors, multi-nationals and regulators around the world envision, build and lead an inclusive, sustainable future. A rare talent Matthew’s recent work includes mentoring Lunar XPrize teams, re-envisioning global education and training with the G20, and helping the world’s largest organisations envision and ideate the future of their products and services, industries, and countries. Matthew's clients include three Prime Ministers and several governments, including the G7, Accenture, Bain & Co, BCG, Credit Suisse, Dell EMC, Dentons, Deloitte, E&Y, GEMS, Huawei, JPMorgan Chase, KPMG, Lego, McKinsey, PWC, Qualcomm, SAP, Samsung, Sopra Steria, T-Mobile, and many more. "The ultimate bioweapon, scientists have developed an Extinction Gene.” https://www.fanaticalfuturist.com/2016/12/scientists-have-developed-the-ultimate-bioweapon-an-extinction-gene/]

How do you get a gene that kills a species to spread through a whole population?

You can either make your gene deadly, and therefore impossible to pass on, or not – and make it useless. The solution in the past has been to try to create what are known as “silent” genes that can spread throughout a population with no negative side effects, for example, either introducing a deadly weakness to a man made chemical into a species genome, or creating dormant but deadly genes that can be activated when the right trigger presents itself.

Recently, with the advent of advanced new in vivo gene editing technology, it’s become possible to make genes that seem to defy evolution – and that means we could soon start releasing animals carrying doomsday, or, extinction genes, that spread with astonishing speed and which eventually kill off an entire species, or even entire ecosystems.

first artificial human (ethics allowing, which of course they won’t, or at least ion the short term).

If we have the technology to eliminate an entire species from the face of the Earth – forever, then the only thing preventing us from pulling the genetic trigger is our moral compass and our belief in our ability to control the outcome and the next time there’s a mass extinction event it might not be an asteroid that’s the culrpit.

# DA: Health Diplomacy

​​

Health diplomacy is an important part of global governance

Kickbusch 2-18-21 Ilona Kickbusch, Haik Nikogosian, Michel Kazatchkine, Mihály Kökény GLOBAL HEALTH CENTRE | 2021 A GUIDE TO GLOBAL HEALTH DIPLOMACY Better health – improved global solidarity – more equity With contributions\* from: Michele Acuto, Universityof Melbourne; Paul Bekkers, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands; Gian Luca Burci, Global Health Centre, IHEID; Emanuele Capobianco, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; Marcelo A.C. Costa, United Nations; Roopa Dhatt, Women in Global Health; Erica Di Ruggiero, University of Toronto, Dalla Lana School of Public Health; Marja Esveld, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands; Satoshi Ezoe, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan; Lemlem Girmatsion, Global Health Centre, IHEID; Githnji Gitahi, Amref Health Africa; Renzo Guinto, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health; Madeleine Heyward, Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations, Geneva, Switzerland; Roger Kampf, World Trade Organization; John Kirton, University of Toronto, Munk School of Global Affairs and Public Policy; Kerstin Kolbe, Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance; Eero Lahtinen, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland; Lindiwe Makubalo, Permanent Mission of South Africa to the United Nations and other International Organizations, Geneva, Switzerland; Colin McIff, Office of Global Affairs at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; Lolem B. Ngong, Amref Health Africa; Miguel Perez La Plante, Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the United Nations, Geneva, Switzerland; Nathita Premabhuti, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand; Catherine Saez, Heath Policy Watch; Flavia Schlegel, Science Governance Partnership, Paris, France; Gaudenz Silberschmidt, World Health Organization; Luis Sundkvist, Editor; Orsolya Süli, NHS Scotland, UK; Zsofia Szilagyi, World Health Organization; Tamar Tchelidze, Permanent Mission of Georgia to the United Nations; Menno Van Hilten, World Health Organization.Diplomacy has been practised for centuries, during which it has undergone many significant changes, some concerning its very nature. Over the past decade in particular, diplomacy has become a constitutive part of the system of global governance, which involves many different venues and actors. This development has been reinforced by the fundamental changes arising from the negotiation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and by the increasing need for global crisis diplomacy. The most important shift has been that away from a mindset centred on development assistance towards acknowledgement of common global goals that can only be achieved if all countries work together – the COVID-19 pandemic has made that even clearer. Despite these changes, three key defining features of diplomacy remain intact: representation, communication and negotiation. Multilateral diplomacy as we know it began with the ad hoc congresses convened in Europe in the 17th century to negotiate war and peace between sovereign States. In 1919 it led to the creation of the first collective security organization: the League of Nations. At the end of the Second World War, multilateral diplomacy was institutionalized more robustly with the establishment of the United Nations (UN). One of the UN system organizations created shortly afterwards was the World Health Organization (WHO), which took up its work in 1948 in Geneva, Switzerland. Over time, many other multilateral venues for health were established but WHO remains the norm-setting organization for health. The WHO Constitution defines health as a human right and this is a guiding principle for all other health organizations (see Box 7). The significant cross-border economic and security impact of developments in such areas as the natural environment and human health made it clear that the issues in question could no longer be resolved at the national level only. As these areas, previously treated under “soft policy” in foreign affairs and diplomacy, gained in importance, new types of international agreements, instruments and organizations were created in response – for example, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change (2015), the revised International Health Regulations (2005), the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (2002) and, most recently in 2020, the COVAX Facility, a global risk-sharing mechanism for pooled procurement and equitable distribution of eventual COVID-19 vaccines. Multilateralism has many definitions – in essence it is governance by the many to address shared problems. It rests on a set of common principles guiding relations among the parties, including agreed rules of behaviour. Multilateralism often takes the form of membership in international organizations, but that is not the only form. Among the various types of multilateralism are universal multilateralism including all States, for example as members of the UN; regional multilateralism, which brings together States in specific geographical regions; values-based multilateralism as exemplified by organizations such as NATO or the European Union and the suggestions to create new bodies that include democracies only; and “minilateralism”, which brings together small groups of States (or “clubs” such as the G20 and the BRICS countries) to tackle specific problems. Multilateralism stands in contrast to bilateralism and unilateralism, and governments have to decide which of these strategies they will adopt in their foreign policy to deal with a particular challenge. Bilateralism means engaging with just one other country, while unilateralism implies acting on one’s own without regard for other countries. Other terms are also in use. In trade negotiations, plurilateral agreements – meaning, for example, a treaty between a limited number of States with a particular interest in the subject of the treaty – have become more prominent. Finally, “polylateral diplomacy” refers to the involvement of many non-State actors in diplomatic processes – something that makes the contemporary diplomatic arena pluralistic, dynamic and complex. This is also referred to as multi-stakeholder diplomacy – the term used in this Guide. A guide to global health diplomacy 21 This Guide focuses on the global health diplomacy practised at international organizations and in other multilateral venues that aim to resolve global health challenges.

**IP protections are essential to modern health diplomacy**

Obijiofor **Aginam 10**, Academic Programme Officer & Director of Studies, Institute for Sustainability and Peace, United Nations University headquarters, Tokyo, Japan; Adjunct Research Professor of Law, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada, “HEALTH OR TRADE? A CRITIQUE OF CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO GLOBAL HEALTH DIPLOMACY,” https://poseidon01.ssrn.com/delivery.php?ID=149097083081123105113085099123123091104014059082060018071001088023116023118119002064117119051059021051011085110010121013091016020070011051015018011008065019104127084042076098081007102099120087031085093119071127122005124010118009001092104124120121094&EXT=pdf&INDEX=TRUE

**The third limb of global health diplomacy critique reflects the complex linkages between “health and trade”18 where the modest achievements in global health diplomacy in the past decade are substantially driven not by events in the health sector but by the normative developments in the trade and economic relations of states enforced by the WTO**. **Although this sounds like “economic globalization triumphalism”, it is nonetheless hard to dispute the fact that it was the patent requirements for pharmaceuticals and other inventions in the WTO TRIPS Agreement that substantially catalyzed the health diplomacy on access to anti-retroviral drugs for HIV/AIDS for millions of poor HIV-positive who live mostly in developing countries. Food safety and security concerns and the hard diplomacy animated by biotechnology advances in food production, although global health issues in their own right, are catalyzed by the developments in the WTO on the SSPS Agreement, and not the subtle “diplomacy” around the WHO/FAO jointly administered Codex Alimentarius Commission standards**. The migration of qualified health professionals from most of Africa to the West is now being driven in complex ways by one of the modes of service supply in the GATS Agreement.

#### Health diplomacy’s key to global cooperation that solves multiple existential threats

**James 17**, Wilmot James, Honorary Professor in the Division of Human Genetics at the University of Cape Town's Medical School and Non-residential Senior Fellow at Bard College’s Hannah Arendt Centre, Ph.D. from University of Wisconsin at Madison, “In an Age of Zika and a Threat of Biochemical Terror, Health Security Must Be Everybody’s Concern”, Daily Maverick, 4-2,<https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2017-04-02-op-ed-in-an-age-of-zika-and-a-threat-of-biochemical-terror-health-security-must-be-everybodys-concern/#.WOY8xTvDHHw> [language modified]

**With Zika there** too **was political failure to act quickly**, give honest advice and confront the abortion conundrum head-on, the result being that 3,000 and likely more children with microcephaly will test the emotional resilience and financial resources of their families to breaking point.

**We should never cease to invest in the public health and medical science of disease, but** it seems to me that **our fundamental problem is not the quality of the health sciences but the grim mediocrity of our politics**. Party-political bickering for short-term gain paralyses and drains the national effort in South Africa as much as it does in the United States, undermining our ability to see with compelling clarity the solutions the issues of the day deserve.

**Health security is humanity’s shared concern. Promoting health and preventing death define us at our most altruistic and advanced.** The Hippocratic Ideal, the concept of the physician as the guardian of human health, encapsulates a fundamental human quality common to all the world’s great religions. **Medicine is one of the earliest and greatest human achievements because it is a co-operative enterprise involving highly skilled individuals; and it is as a result of cooperation** – and our unusual ability for complex language – that cumulative **civilisation is possible**.

**In the age of globalisation, it is health security**, a recent Lancet editorial stated, **that “is now the most important foreign policy issue of our time”. The rapid emergence and re-emergence of pathogenic infectious disease, of which Zika is the most recent, the slow but steady cumulative acts of nature associated with climate change, high-risk forced migration caused by desperation and war, the creeping reality of biochemical [use]** **~~terror~~ and the threat of nuclear war, propel human survival** and well-being **to the frontline of what today must be everybody’s concern**.

**The field of health diplomacy provides an unprecedented opportunity to build human solidarity. It is an area of human endeavour that cuts through inherited antagonisms. Governments that offer health improvements as part of aid to nations with whom they wish to develop stronger succeed in cultivating deeper cultural relationships precisely because of their direct benefit to citizens**. To advance health diplomacy requires health leaders with an inclusive global vision…
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Cap solves warming---sustainable, private-industry tech key, alt fails and results in transition wars.

Smith 19 (Noah Smith; PhD in economics from the University of Michigan and Bloomberg Opinion columnist. He was an assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University; 4/5/19; "Dumping Capitalism Won’t Save the Planet"; https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-04-05/capitalism-is-more-likely-to-limit-climate-change-than-socialism; Bloomberg; accessed 7/23/19; LR)

It has become fashionable on social media and in certain publications to argue that capitalism is killing the planet. Even renowned investor Jeremy Grantham, hardly a radical, made that assertion last year. The basic idea is that the profit motive drives the private sector to spew carbon into the air with reckless abandon. Though many economists and some climate activists believe that the problem is best addressed by modifying market incentives with a carbon tax, many activists believe that the problem can’t be addressed without rebuilding the economy along centrally planned lines. The climate threat is certainly dire, and carbon taxes are unlikely to be enough to solve the problem. But eco-socialism is probably not going to be an effective method of addressing that threat. Dismantling an entire economic system is never easy, and probably would touch off armed conflict and major political upheaval. In the scramble to win those battles, even the socialists would almost certainly abandon their limitation on fossil-fuel use — either to support military efforts, or to keep the population from turning against them. The precedent here is the Soviet Union, whose multidecade effort to reshape its economy by force amid confrontation with the West led to profound environmental degradation. The world's climate does not have several decades to spare. Even without international conflict, there’s little guarantee that moving away from capitalism would mitigate our impact on the environment. Since socialist leader Evo Morales took power in Bolivia, living standards have improved substantially for the average Bolivian, which is great. But this has come at the cost of higher emissions. Meanwhile, the capitalist U.S managed to decrease its per capita emissions a bit during this same period (though since the U.S. is a rich country, its absolute level of emissions is much higher). In other words, in terms of economic growth and carbon emissions, Bolivia looks similar to more capitalist developing countries. That suggests that faced with a choice of enriching their people or helping to save the climate, even socialist leaders will often choose the former. And that same political calculus will probably hold in China and the U.S., the world’s top carbon emitters — leaders who demand draconian cuts in living standards in pursuit of environmental goals will have trouble staying in power. The best hope for the climate therefore lies in reducing the tradeoff between material prosperity and carbon emissions. That requires technology — solar, wind and nuclear power, energy storage, electric cars and other vehicles, carbon-free cement production and so on. The best climate policy plans all involve technological improvement as a key feature. Recent developments show that the technology-centered approach can work. A recent report by Bloomberg New Energy Finance analyzed about 7000 projects in 46 countries, and found that large drops in the cost of solar power from photovoltaic systems, wind power and lithium-ion batteries have made utility-scale renewable electricity competitive with fossil fuels. A 76 percent decline in the cost of energy for short-term battery storage since 2012 is especially important. In a blog post, futurist and energy writer Ramez Naam underscores the significance of these developments. Naam notes the important difference between renewables being cheap enough to outprice new fossil-fuel plants, and being inexpensive enough to undercut existing plants. The former is already the case across much of the world, which is among the reasons for an 84 percent decrease in the number of new coal-fired plants worldwide since 2015. But when it becomes cheaper to scrap existing fossil-fuel plants and build renewables in their place, it will allow renewables to start replacing coal and gas much more quickly. Naam cites examples from Florida and Indiana where this is already being done. He cites industry predictions that replacing existing fossil-fuel plants with renewables will be economically efficient almost everywhere at some point in the next decade. Electricity is far from the only source of carbon emissions — there’s also transportation, manufacturing (especially of steel and cement), home and office heating, and agriculture to worry about. But the rapid advance of solar technology is a huge victory in the struggle against climate change, because it will allow people all over the world to have electricity without cooking the planet. And how was this victory achieved? A combination of smart government policy and private industry. Massachusetts Institute of Technology researchers Goksin Kavlak, James McNerney and Jessika Trancik in a recent paper evaluated the factors behind the solar-price decline from 1980 to 2012. They concluded that from 1980 to 2001, government-funded research and development was the main factor in bringing down costs, but from 2001 to 2012, the biggest factor was economies of scale. These economies of scale were driven by private industry increasing output, but with government subsidies helping to increase the incentive to ramp up production. It’s apparent, therefore, that both government and profit-seeking enterprises have their roles to play. Government funds the development of early-stage technology and then helps push the private sector toward adopting those technologies, while private companies compete to find ever-cheaper methods of implementation. Instead of eco-socialism, it’s eco-industrialism. If there’s any system that can beat climate change, this looks like it.

#### Growth is good solves Poverty –– it also solves the environment

Rhonheimer 20 Martin Rhonheimer 2-7-2020 “Capitalism is Good for the Poor – and for the Environment” <https://austrian-institute.org/en/subjects-en/catholic-social-doctrine-2/capitalism-is-good-for-the-poor-and-for-the-environment/> (professor at the Pontifical University of the Holy Cross)//Elmer

It is not social policy but capitalism that has created today’s prosperity. What is important is that what made today’s mass prosperity possible – a phenomenon unprecedented in history – was not social policy or social legislation, organised trade union pressure, or corrective interventions in the capitalist economy, but rather market capitalism itself, due to its enormous potential for innovation and the ever-increasing productivity of human labour that resulted from it. Increasing prosperity and quality of life are always the result of increasing labour productivity. Only increased productivity enabled higher social standards, better working conditions, the overcoming of child labour, a higher level of education, and the emergence of human capital. This process of increasing triumph over poverty and the constantly rising living standards of the general masses is taking place on a global scale – but only where the market economy and capitalist entrepreneurship are able to spread. From industrial overexploitation of nature to ecological awareness The first phase of industrialisation and capitalism was characterised by an enormous consumption of resources and frequent overexploitation of nature, which soon gave the impression that this process could not be sustainable. Since the end of the 19th century, disaster and doom scenarios have repeatedly been put forward, but in retrospect they have proved to be wrong: The combination of technological innovation, market competition, and entrepreneurial profit-seeking (with the compulsion to constantly minimise costs) have meant that these scenarios never occurred. The ever-increasing population has been increasingly better supplied thanks to innovative technologies, ever-increasing output with lower consumption of resources less harmful to the environment – e.g. less arable land in agriculture, or oil and electricity instead of coal for rapidly increasing mobility. More recent disaster scenarios, such as those spread by reputable scientists since the late 1960s and in the 1970s, have also proved to be inaccurate. The reason things developed differently was the always underestimated innovative dynamism of the capitalist market economy, a growing ecological awareness and, as a result, legislative intervention that took advantage of the logic of market capitalism: As a result of the ecological movement that had come out of the United States since 1970, wise legislation began to use the price mechanism to apply market incentives to internalize negative externalities. Environmental pollution was given a price-tag. This led to an enormous decrease in air pollution and other ecological consequences of growth, which is only possible in free, market-based societies, because the production process here is characterized by competition and constant pressure to reduce costs, i.e. to the most profitable use of resources. On the other hand, all forms of socialism, i.e. a state-controlled economy, have proved to be ecological disasters and have left behind destruction of gigantic proportions, without providing the population with anything that is near comparable in prosperity, often even by destroying existing prosperity, such as happened in Venezuela. Capitalist profit motive combined with digitalization as a solution: Increasing decoupling of growth and resource consumption Moreover, technological innovations combined with capitalist profit-seeking and market competition have led to a new and surprising phenomenon over the past decades, which is still hardly noticed in the public debate: the decoupling of growth and resource consumption (“dematerialization”). In a wide variety of industrial sectors, the developed countries, above all the U.S., are now achieving ever greater productive output with increasingly fewer resources. This has a lot to do with technology, especially the digitalization of the economy and of our entire lives. As the well-known MIT professor Andrew McAfee shows in his book More from Less, published in October 2019, this process also follows the logic of capitalist profit maximization. To get it going, we do not need politics, even though wise, properly incentivizing legislation can be helpful and sometimes necessary. Above all, however, it is the combination of technological innovation, capitalist profit-seeking, and market-based entrepreneurial competition that will also solve the problem of man-made global warming. In addition, property rights and their protection are decisive for the careful use of natural resources. And where this is not possible, legal support for collective self-governing structures, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, are important—as is analysed by Nobel Economic Prize winner Elinor Ostrom. By contrast, the growing ideologically motivated anti-capitalist eco-activism, and the policies influenced by it, are leading in the wrong direction, distracting precisely from what would be best for the climate and the environment—and distracting us from what could help protect us against the inevitable consequences of global warming.

#### Cap inevitable— it’s too malleable and there are no viable alts.

**Speth 8**, James, [American environmental lawyer [ex-dean of Yale school of forestry and environmentalism] 208, “*The bridge at the end of the world*,” 188-9, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.1477-8947.2008.209\_3.x

Of course, the big problem facing all discussions of alternatives to capitalism is that there do not seem to be any alternatives. Throughout the Cold War, the alternative was state socialism or communism, but it is fading fast around the globe. Asked about alternatives to capitalism today, most people draw, blank. Some would add, for good reason. It is therefore worth noting the diversity of economic systems both within capitalism and within socialism, a point stressed by the Tellus Institute." Within capitalism, a variety of national economic systems exist, where the key variable is the degree of engagement of government in determining economic priorities and social conditions. At one end of the spectrum, the so-called Anglo-American model approximates laissez-faire. Here, the market tends to dominate the state. In Scandinavia and elsewhere on the Continent, one finds varieties of social democratic capitalism." Social democratic nations exert greater public control over capital investment and have created more comprehensive social programs including higher minimum wages and unemployment compensation, greater protections against layoffs, free or near-free health care and schooling, and so on. In these countries the market and the state are seen as partners. In Japan and elsewhere in Asia, there are systems that can be described as state capitalism, where there is heavy government involvement in directing the economy and where the state tends to dominate the market.

#### Resources – profit motive key to effective resource management

Fitzmaurice 15 Matthew Fitzmaurice 3-23-2015 “ONLY CAPITALISM CAN SAVE THE PLANET” <http://ensia.com/voices/only-capitalism-can-save-the-planet/> (CEO of EcoAlpha Asset Management LLC.)//Elmer

Here’s the thing, though: where there are problems to be solved, there’s money to be made. And where there’s money to be made, we awaken one of the world’s most powerful forces for change: capitalism. Of course capitalism has played a starring role in distressing the planet’s resources. Historically, the combination of unchecked industry, a readiness to externalize costs and a relentless thirst for growth have plundered and polluted the earth. It’s not a debate, but simple fact that our population size and economies cannot continue on their present trajectories without exhausting the world’s resources. Yet, a rapidly expanding global middle class — increasingly urbanized and hungry for protein — threatens further and accelerating distress. The hopeful news is that businesses, with their almost singular focus on economic self-interest, and governments, motivated by a variety of interests, are beginning to recognize and address in earnest these inevitable problems. Today, the businesses that develop practical and affordable solutions to burdened resource problems will end up being the world’s most profitable companies. No longer can they be considered “sustainability” businesses. They are everyday businesses with a long view, targeting problems that are not going away. That’s smart business. Burdened resources have become a strong economic driver for businesses of all sizes, in all industries everywhere to spend and change — and one that will only grow in scope and intensity over time. The companies that provide effective solutions to burdened resources will provide superior risk-adjusted returns to their investors as business and governments accelerate their solutions spending out of their own economic self-interest. And because the products, technologies and services these companies provide are common solutions to global problems — and are therefore exponentially repeatable — these investments will have amplified positive impact on global resource scarcity issues. Too often people have a narrow view of these solutions, thinking only of solar panels and windmills. But solutions are enormously diverse: They include, among many others, agricultural drones that monitor soil conditions, smart irrigation technology that delivers water only where and when it’s really needed, more efficient distributed energy generation and component suppliers that make cars use less gas. We face a new reality in which our economic self-interest and the long-term well-being of the planet are coming into alignment. As a whole, the human race has a poor track record when it comes to altruism. Although there are a great many saints among us who spend — and even sacrifice — their lives to help others, most of us are hard pressed to take care of ourselves and our families. We have a much better track record when it comes to investing money in our own self- interest, which has fueled the unprecedented innovation, economic and life-expectancy growth of the past century. In the past, many people who invested in sustainable solutions were motivated principally by conscience, willing to accept reduced returns in order to invest their money in a way that was consistent with their beliefs and convictions — be they religious, social or environmental. Now, however, we face a new reality in which our economic self-interest and the long-term well-being of the planet are coming into alignment. Because we have to face the reality of burdened resources, there’s money in it. Recently, some asset managers have based investments on environmental, social and governance screening, betting that good corporate citizens are inherently better-managed companies, which will therefore be more profitable over time. Increasingly, however, ESG screening is becoming more pervasive and will likely over time become commonplace, robbing this sort of screening as a differentiator when making investment decisions. The primary goal for investing in sustainable solutions is to achieve superior risk-adjusted returns. Companies that provide solutions to the issues of burdened resources will be the recipients of a massive global spend cycle, no matter one’s motivation. The fact that one’s investment is also part of the solution rather than the problem is worth getting excited about. Self-interest is what moves markets. According to McKinsey’s report, How to make Green Growth the new normal, “In order to mobilize the US$3 trillion a year that will be needed to build a resource-efficient growth model, investing in the markets of the future needs to be seen as possessing superior risk-return characteristics.” No government subsidy or charity case can move the needle for long. Only capitalism has the power to retool industries, reshape economies and rebuild infrastructure across the planet. It’s a big part of what got us into this mess, but it’s also what will get us out.

#### 2] Growth is consistent w/ reducing environmental damage – this card slaps and has empirics

McAfee 20 Andrew McAfee 10-6-2020 "Why Degrowth Is the Worst Idea on the Planet" <https://www.wired.com/story/opinion-why-degrowth-is-the-worst-idea-on-the-planet/> (a principal research scientist at MIT, is cofounder and codirector of the MIT Initiative on the Digital Economy at the MIT Sloan School of Management)//Elmer

Easing Pollution, Not Exporting It In some important areas, however, a very different pattern emerged after 1970: Growth continued, **but environmental harm decreased**. This decoupling occurred first with pollution, and first in the rich world. In the US, for example, aggregate levels of six common air pollutants have declined by 77 percent, even as gross domestic product **increased by 285 percent** and population by 60 percent. In the UK, annual tonnage of particulate emissions dropped by more than 75 percent between 1970 and 2016, and of the main polluting chemicals by about 85 percent. Similar gains are common across the highest-income countries. How were these reductions achieved? The two possibilities are cleanup and offshoring. Either rich countries figured out how to reduce their “air pollution per dollar” so much that overall pollution went down even as their economies grew, or they sent so much of their dirty production overseas that the air at home got cleaner. The first of these paths reduces the total burden of human-caused pollution; the second just rearranges it. The evidence is overwhelming that rich countries **cleaned up their air pollution** much more than they outsourced it. **For one, a great deal of air pollution comes from highway vehicles and power plants, and rich countries haven’t outsourced driving and generating electricity to low-income ones.** In fact, **high-income countries haven't even offshored most of their industry**. The US and UK both manufacture more than they did 50 years ago (at least until the Covid-19 pandemic sharply reduced output), and Germany has been a net exporter since 2000 while continuing to drive down air pollution. The rest of the world has been exporting its manufacturing pollution to Germany (to use degrowthers’ phrasing), yet Germans are breathing cleaner air than they were 20 years ago. Rich countries have reduced their air pollution not by embracing degrowth or offshoring, but instead by enacting and enforcing **smart regulation**. As economists Joseph Shapiro and Reed Walker concluded in a 2018 study about the US, “changes in environmental regulation, rather than changes in productivity and trade, account for most of the emissions reductions.” Research about the cleanup of US waters also concludes that well-designed and enforced regulations have successfully reduced pollution. It is true that the US and other rich countries now import lots of products from China and other nations with higher pollution levels. But if there were no international trade at all, and rich countries had to rely exclusively on their domestic industries to make everything they consume, they’d still have much cleaner air and water than they did 50 years ago. As a 2004 Advances in Economic Analysis and Policy study summarized: “We find no evidence that domestic production of pollution-intensive goods in the US is being replaced by imports from overseas.” The rich world’s success at decoupling growth from pollution is an inconvenient fact for degrowthers. Even more inconvenient is **China's recent success** at doing the same. China’s export-led, manufacturing-heavy economy has been growing at meteoric rates, but between 2013 and 2017 air pollution in densely populated areas declined by more than 30 percent. Here again the government mandated and monitored pollution declines and so decoupled growth from an important category of environmental harm. Prosperity Bends the Curve China's progress with air pollution is heartening, but it's not surprising to most economists. It's a clear example of the environmental **Kuznets curve** (EKC) in action. Named for the economist Simon Kuznets, EKC posits a relationship between a country's affluence and the condition of its environment. As GDP per capita rises from an initial low level, so too does environmental damage; but as affluence continues to increase, the harms level off and then start to decline. The EKC is clearly visible in the pollution histories of today's rich countries, and it's now taking shape in China and elsewhere. Also consider air pollution death rates around the world. As the invaluable website Our World in Data puts it, “Rates have typically fallen across high-income countries: almost everywhere in Europe, but also in Canada, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Israel and South Korea and other countries. But rates have also fallen across upper-middle income countries too, including China and Brazil. In low and lower-middle income countries, rates have increased over this period.” The EKC is a direct refutation of a core idea of degrowth: that environmental harms must always rise as populations and economies do. It's not surprising that today's degrowth advocates rarely discuss the large reductions in air and water pollution that have accompanied higher prosperity in so many places around the world. Instead, **degrowthers now focus heavily on one kind of pollution: greenhouse gas emissions**. The claims made are familiar ones: that any apparent reductions in greenhouse gas emissions in rich countries are due to offshoring rather than actual decarbonization. Thanks to the Global Carbon Project, we can see if this is the case. GCP has calculated “consumption-based emissions” for many countries going back to 1990, taking into account imports and exports, yielding the greenhouse gas emissions embodied in all the goods and services consumed in each country each year. For several of the world's richest countries, including Germany, Italy, France, the UK, and the US, graphs of consumption-based carbon emissions **follow the familiar EKC**. The US, for example, has 22reduced its total (not per capita) consumption-based CO2 emissions by more than 13 percent since 2007. Most Popular face mask GEAR 22 Face Masks We Actually Like to Wear ADRIENNE SO Man, Poster, Brochure, Paper, Flyer, Human, Person, and Collage. These reductions are not mainly due to enhanced regulation. Instead, they've come about because of a combination of **tech progress and market forces**. Solar and wind power have become much cheaper in recent years and have displaced coal for electricity generation. Natural gas, which when burned emits fewer greenhouse gases per unit of energy than does coal (even after taking methane leakage into account), has also become much cheaper and more abundant in the US as a result of the fracking revolution. To ensure that these greenhouse gas declines continue to spread and accelerate, we should apply the lessons we've learned from previous pollution reduction success. In particular, we should make it expensive to emit carbon, then watch the emitters work hard to reduce this expense. The best way to do this is with a carbon dividend, which is a tax on carbon emissions where the revenues are not kept by the government but instead are rebated to people as a dividend. William Nordhaus won the 2018 Nobel Prize in economics in part for his work on the carbon dividend, and an open letter advocating its implementation in the US has been signed by more than 3,500 economists. It's an idea whose time has come.