# Off

## 1st off – Topicality

#### Interpretation—the aff may not be untopical and specify medicines

#### There is a “rules reading” in the context of moral statements

Cohen 1 — (Ariel Cohen, Professor of Linguistics @ Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, PhD Computational Linguistics from Carnegie Mellon University, “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars”. Journal of Semantics 18: 183-209, Oxford University Press, 2001, accessed 12-7-20, HKR-AM) \*\*BP = bare plurals

According to the rules and regulations view, on the other hand, generic sentences do not get their truth or falsity as a consequence of properties of individual instances. Instead, generic sentences are evaluated with regard to rules and regulations, which are basic, irreducible entities in the world. Each generic sentence denotes a rule; if the rule is in effect, in some sense (different theories suggest different characterizations of what it means for a rule to be in effect), the sentence is true, otherwise it is false. The rule may be physical, biological, social, moral, etc. The paradigmatic cases for which this view seems readily applicable are sentences that refer to conventions, i.e. man-made, explicit rules and regulations, such as the following example (Carlson 1995: 225):

(40) Bishops move diagonally.

Carlson describes the two approaches as a dichotomy: one has to choose one or the other, but not both. One way to decide which approach to choose is to consider a case where the behavior of observed instances conflicts with an explicit rule. Indeed, Carlson discusses just such a case. He describes a supermarket where bananas sell for $0.49/lb, so that (41a) is true. One day, the manager decides to raise the price to $1.00/lb. Immediately after the price has changed, claims Carlson, sentence (41a) becomes false and sentence (41b) becomes true, although the overwhelming majority of sold bananas were sold for $0.49/lb.

(41) a. Bananas sell for $0.49/lb.

b. Bananas sell for $1.00/lb.

Consequently, Carlson reaches the conclusion that the rules and regulations approach is the correct one, whereas the inductivist view is wrong.

While I share Carlson’s judgements, I do not accept the conclusion he draws from them. Suppose the price has, indeed, changed, but the supermarket employs incompetent cashiers who consistently use the old price by mistake, so that customers are still charged $0.49/lb. In this case, I think there is a reading of (41a) which is true, and a reading of (41b) which is false. These readings are more salient if the sentence is modified by expressions such as actually or in fact:

(42) a. Bananas actually sell for $0.49/lb.

b. In fact, bananas sell for $1.00/lb.

BP generics, I claim, are ambiguous: on one reading they express a descriptive generalization, stating the way things are. Under the other reading, they carry a normative force, and require that things be a certain way. When they are used in the former sense, they should be analysed by some sort of inductivist account; when they are used in the latter sense, they ought to be analysed as referring to a rule or a regulation. The respective logical forms of the two readings are different; whereas the former reading involves, in some form or another, quantification, the latter has a simple predicate-argument structure: the argument is the rule or regulation, and the predicate holds of it just in case the rule is ‘in effect’.

#### Violation—they specified insulin—

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Precision – if we win definitions the aff is not topical. The resolution is the only predictable stasis point for dividing ground—any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

**2]Even if we don’t win our definition, vote negative on limits:**

**A] Quantitative –– unlimited topics incentivize obscure affs that negs won’t have prep on – limits are key to reciprocal prep burden**

**B] Qualitative – they take away generic turns like the Innovation DA and functionally jettison medicines from the topic, which shifts away from the core topic lit of property protections – also means there is no universal DA to spec affs**

#### They deck fairness which ow/s – we went into our tournament thinking we would get an aff that defends the resolution, not one subset of it, and now I have literally nothing to read.

**3] TVA solves – read the aff as advantage – most authors advocate for a change in WTO policy or TRIPS**

**4] No PICs offense – potential neg abuse doesn’t justify aff abuse because that would permit infinite 1AC abuse**

#### Fairness is a voting issue because debate is a game and we compete in it to win.

#### Competing Interps – reasonability incentivizes a race to the bottom of the worst interp

#### Drop the debater to deter abuse. Drop the arg is illogical because we indict your whole aff.

#### No rvis – you have a burden to be topical.

## 2nd off – Innovation DA

#### Pharmaceutical innovation is accelerating now – new medicines are substantially better than existing treatments.

Wills, MBA, and Lipkus, PhD, 20 – Todd J. Wills [Managing Director @ Chemical Abstracts Service, MBA from THE Ohio State University] and Alan H. Lipkus [Senior Data Analyst @ Chemical Abstracts Service, PhD Physical Chemistry from the University of Rochester], “Structural Approach to Assessing the Innovativeness of New Drugs Finds Accelerating Rate of Innovation,” ACS Medicinal Chemistry Letters, Vol. 11, 2020, <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/acsmedchemlett.0c00319> C.VC

Despite recent concerns over an innovation crisis, this analysis shows pharmaceutical innovation has actually increased over the last several decades based on the structural novelty of approved NMEs. The higher proportion of Pioneers over the most recent decade is a sign that innovation within the industry is accelerating rather than slowing. It is also an encouraging sign for the state of innovation in drug discovery that these Pioneers are significantly more likely to be the source of promising new therapies that are expected to provide substantial clinical advantages over existing treatments. Drug hunters are discovering Pioneers in newer and less explored regions of chemical space as they are increasingly found on scaffolds first reported in the CAS REGISTRY five or less years prior to their IND year or on scaffolds populated with 50 or less other compounds at the time of IND.

As scale becomes less of a strategic advantage, Big Pharma’s share of Pioneers has decreased even though the number of Big Pharma originated Pioneers has increased. This has created a structural innovation gap between Big Pharma and the Rest of Ecosystem which has widened over the last two decades as the Rest of Ecosystem is now responsible for originating almost 3 out of every 4 Pioneers. Pioneers originated by the Rest of Ecosystem are increasingly on new scaffolds, while a majority of Big Pharma originated Pioneers have historically been on new scaffolds.

The work presented here was intended as a study of drug innovation at a macro level. As a result, it included substances of various sizes with different degrees of complexity belonging to a range of functional and drug classes. Even though it was outside the scope of the present work to study specific subsets, such focused studies could yield additional insights into how innovation at a more micro level has changed over time. Other interesting subsets of our data set are the shapes and scaffolds of the Settlers and Colonists. Many of these shapes and scaffolds are privileged in the sense that they are seemingly capable of serving as ligands for a diverse array of target proteins. A separate study of the Settlers and Colonists as well as their side chains could provide insights into possible target-specific innovation trends.

As it often takes more than 10 years after initial discovery for an experimental drug to gain FDA approval, any measure of drug innovation that relies on the time of approval incorporates a significant time lag between initial discovery and ultimate approval. However, characterizing drug innovation based on structural novelty provides a means to assess the forward-looking innovation potential of an experimental drug at the time of initial discovery by comparing its framework information (at the scaffold and shape level) with prior FDA-approved drugs. Therefore, a separate study of drug candidates with publically disclosed structures currently in clinical development could provide additional insights into innovation trends at an FDA regulatory review level and serve as a leading indicator of innovation trends at an FDA approval level.

Given the tremendous opportunity represented by the vast amount of chemical space yet to be explored, drug-hunters of all types will continue pushing the boundaries to find promising new therapies in previously unexplored areas of chemical space. The race to discover these new drugs will be fueled by further advancements in screening approaches and in-silico methods (including innovations related to machine learning algorithms and molecular representations). However, comprehensive data on known shapes and scaffolds can fast track the identification of meaningful open areas of chemical space (shapes or scaffolds that are potentially important but have never been used as the basis for a molecule) to further explore.

#### The biopharmaceutical industry is uniquely reliant on IP protections – undermining them would kill innovation by making an already expensive process completely unfeasible.

Kristina M. Lybecker, PhD, 17 [PhD Economics, Associate Professor of Economics @ Colorado College], “Intellectual Property Rights Protection and the Biopharmaceutical Industry: How Canada Measures Up,” Fraser Institute, January 2017, <https://www.fraserinstitute.org/sites/default/files/intellectual-property-rights-protection-and-the%20biopharmaceutical-industry.pdf> C.VC

The unique structure of the innovative biopharmaceutical industry necessitates a variety of intellectual property protection mechanisms. In particular, the industry is characterized by a research and development (R&D) process that is lengthy, expensive, uncertain, and risky. According to DiMasi and colleagues, the estimated cost of developing a new medicine is US$2.6 billion (DiMasi, Grabowski, and Hansen, 2016).2 In addition, the time required to develop a new drug is also significant, averaging 10 to 15 years without any guarantee of success (PhRMA, n.d.). While these figures are highly controversial, biopharmaceutical innovation is unquestionably an expensive and lengthy undertaking.3 For the biopharmaceutical industry, innovation and its protection are essential and the source of both profits and growth. As such, patent protection is disproportionally more important for ensuring that the innovator appropriates the returns to R&D for the biopharmaceutical industry than virtually any other. Extending the findings of the 1987 “Yale Survey” (Levin, Klevorick, Nelson, and Winter, 1987), the “Carnegie Mellon Survey” established that while patents are again considered “unambiguously the least effective appropriability mechanisms,” the drug industry and other scholars regard them as strictly more effective than alternative mechanisms (Cohen, Nelson, and Walsh, 1996). The industry’s disproportionate reliance on patents and other forms of intellectual property protection is confirmed in numerous other studies.4

In essence, IPR protections provide innovative biopharmaceutical firms with an assurance of some return on their investment, thus creating incentives for the development of new technologies that could otherwise be easily replicated and sold by competitors. Due to the tremendous fixed costs required to develop new treatments and cures, a significant potential exists for free riding by follower firms, a market failure that would prevent investment in innovation were it not for the patents and other forms of intellectual property protections that provide a limited period of market exclusivity or other such incentives. Fundamentally, patents amount to an efficiency tradeoff. Society provides innovators with a limited period of market exclusivity to encourage innovation in exchange for public access to this knowledge. In exchange for the temporary static loss from market exclusivity, society gains complete knowledge of the innovation through disclosure, a permanent dynamic gain. Through this tradeoff, the existing patent system corrects the market failure that would stymie innovation. In its Apotex Inc. v. Wellcome Foundation Ltd. finding, Justice Binnie wrote for the Supreme Court of Canada, “A patent, as has been said many times, is not intended as an accolade or civic award for ingenuity. It is a method by which inventive solutions to practical problems are coaxed into the public domain by the promise of a limited monopoly for a limited time. Disclosure is the quid pro quo for valuable proprietary rights to exclusivity which are entirely the statutory creature of the Patent Act” (para. 37).

#### Pharmaceutical innovation is key to protecting against future pandemics, bioterrorism, and antibiotic resistance.

**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 quantitive 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 pharmaceutical 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.

#### The plan sets a precedent that IP means nothing – that dooms long term biopharma innovation.

Peter J. Pitts 21, former associate commissioner of the FDA, is president of the Center for Medicine in the Public Interest, “Waiving Covid-19 Vaccine Patents Is a Bad Idea and Sets a Dangerous Precedent,” 6-21-2021, https://medecon.org/waiving-covid-19-vaccine-patents-is-a-bad-idea-and-sets-a-dangerous-precedent/

It all sounds so simple: to hasten the end of the pandemic globally, suspend intellectual property protections on Covid-19 vaccines to allow swift production of low-cost copies the world over. The Biden administration has bought into exactly that strategy at the World Trade Organization.

But some simple ideas are also simplistic, and this one is dangerously so. Waiving patent rights for Covid-19 vaccines will actually slow their availability in the developing world, thereby prolonging the pandemic. The production of these breakthrough Covid-19 vaccines requires sophisticated processes, procedures, staff training, material, and manufacturing. Under typical patent-protected arrangements for new global production facilities, patent-holders voluntarily license their product information to qualified third party-manufacturers. The patent-owners work closely with the licensees to stand up facilities that meet rigorous technological specifications and standards for safety. Even under ideal conditions, it can take a year or longer to build out this infrastructure the right way. The WTO waiver blows up this careful process by allowing pretty much anyone to go into the business of producing Covid-19 vaccines. Suddenly, it’s the wild west out there, with legitimate producers trying to compete with aggressive cost and corner-cutters, to say nothing of the outright fraud that has long driven the lucrative counterfeit drug trade. All the research demonstrating the safety and efficacy of the Covid-19 vaccines goes out the window under such conditions. Nor is such a process going to produce faster results. Historically, under compulsory rather than voluntary licensing arrangements, it has taken even legitimate generic manufacturers years to receive the formulas, work out logistical challenges, and scale up production. In one case of compulsory licensing, it took over four years to bring a generic AIDS drug to Rwanda. The World Health Organization regularly publishes a list of “essential” medications, the vast majority of which patent protections have long expired. Any generic manufacturer can therefore set itself up producing them. Yet the WHO reports that availability of these medicines in many parts of the developing world remains spotty, at best. The quality of many of these essential medicines is also questionable. Yet none of the drugs on the WHO list are in the same universe of complexity as the Covid-19 vaccines. The patent system is not the problem here. But, some ask, why should private companies enjoy the property rights to innovation driven by government funding? This question likewise misses the mark. In a study of 478 drugs less than 10 percent had a public-sector patent associated with it. While providing no gain, compulsory licensing promises lots of pain. Shunting aside patent and intellectual property rights sends a dangerous signal to innovative biopharmaceutical companies and their investors. Biopharmaceutical research is risky. It costs almost $3 billion, on average, to bring a single medicine to pharmacy shelves. Biotech investors take these risks because of strong patent protection like those in the United States. Scientists in America now develop over half of all new drugs worldwide. It’s important to understand the current advocacy for a “temporary” IP waiver. A small but vocal and influential public health policy cohort believes that IP protections are the most significant cause of global healthcare disparities. Their philosophies repeat and reinforce many misconceptions about the problem of improving global access to medicines. The reality is that, in order to save the world, we must all work together as partners. A free-market healthcare paradigm for drug development, although far from perfect, works. A well-appointed armamentarium of Covid-19 diagnostic tools, therapeutics, and vaccines – all invented in under one year, speaks to the power of today’s innovation ecosystem. That ecosystem is built on IP protections. Right now, under voluntary licensing, global production capacity for Covid vaccines and treatments is expanding and accelerating. A move to nullify IP will not result in a single resident of the developing world getting vaccinated one minute sooner.

#### Bioterrorism and future pandemics cause extinction.

Hamish **De Bretton**-Gordon, CBRN Expert @ British Army, **20** [Director @ DBG Defense, Consultant on CBRN and Biosecurity], “Biosecurity in the Wake of COVID-19: The Urgent Action Needed,” Combatting Terrorism Center Sentinel, November/December 2020, Volume 13, Issue 11, <https://ctc.usma.edu/biosecurity-in-the-wake-of-covid-19-the-urgent-action-needed/> C.VC

Policymakers around the world did not grasp just how large the impact of a bio threat could be. Beyond the enormous human and economic impact, the current pandemic has exposed the weakness, lack of preparedness, and poor responsiveness of healthcare systems of even highly developed countries like the United States and the United Kingdom. And the virus has inflicted carnage, even though SARS-CoV-2 (the virus that causes COVID-19) is not especially virulent. The world may be confronted with other viruses in the future whose combination of virulence (the harm a pathogen does to its host), transmissibility, and other characteristics pose much greater danger.

While overwhelming evidence points to SARS-CoV-2 spontaneously spreading to humans, the advances in synthetic biology and the growth in the number of Level 3 and 4 biocontainment facilities around the world storing deadly viruses1 mean there is also the very real possibility that in the future, bad actors will try to engineer or steal/obtain a highly transmissible and highly virulent virus and unleash it onto the world. Another risk is accidental releases from such biocontainment facilities.

COVID-19, a highly transmissible but not very virulent pathogen, has had a devastating global impact, a fact that will not have gone unnoticed by rogue states and terror organizations. Advances in synthetic biology have created tools that could be put to malevolent use. In the last two decades, scientists synthesized the poliovirus from its genetic sequence,2 recreated the 1918 Spanish flu virus,3 and succeeded in modifying the H5N1 avian flu virus so that it resulted (in a research laboratory) in airborne transmission among mammals.4 In the future, we should think of weaponized biology as no less of an existential threat to the planet than weaponized atomic science. It should also be noted that the fear and panic that even a medium-scale bioterror attack could create could have dangerous implications that may rival or even surpass the immediate loss of life.

The Need to Rethink Likelihood

Given the fact that in late 2019 when, as far as is known, COVID-19 cases first started emerging in China, it had been more than a century since the previous catastrophic outbreak (the 1918-1919 “Spanish flu” pandemic),d it was unsurprising that many thought of such pandemics as a one-in-a-100-year event. Such assumptions should no longer hold. The encroachment of human settlements into areas that had previously been sanctuaries for wildlife5 and the popularity in some parts of the world of markets where people and wild animals are brought into proximity have made it more likely viruses will make the species leap to human beings.e And when they do, as the COVID-19 pandemic illustrated, the interconnectedness of a world in which millions of people fly each day6 means they can spread very rapidly.

There is also growing concern about engineered viruses. Not only have advances in synthetic biology (SynBio) created growing capacity for extremely dangerous viruses to be engineered in a laboratory, but the number of people with access to potentially dangerous ‘dual use’ technology has greatly expanded and continues to expand, making malevolent use of such technology ever more likely.

In the August 2020 issue of this publication, scientists at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point warned that:

The wide availability of the protocols, procedures, and techniques necessary to produce and modify living organisms combined with an exponential increase in the availability of genetic data is leading to a revolution in science affecting the threat landscape that can be rivaled only by the development of the atomic bomb. As the technology improves, the level of education and skills necessary to engineer biological agents decreases. Whereas only state actors historically had the resources to develop and employ biological weapons, SynBio is changing the threat paradigm.

## 3rd off – Purchasing CP and Debt Ceiling DA

#### CP: The United States federal government should commit to purchasing sufficient doses of insulin to meet local demand and establish public-private partnerships to expand global insulin manufacturing capacity.

#### The Debt Ceiling expansion gives Democrats two months to finalize and pass Biden’s spending package – every moment is necessary to resolve intraparty disputes

Cochrane 10/7 Cochrane, Emily. Emily Cochrane is a correspondent based in Washington. She has covered Congress since late 2018, focusing on the annual debate over government funding and economic legislation, ranging from emergency pandemic relief to infrastructure. "Senate Leaders Agree to Vote on Short-Term Debt Ceiling Increase." N.Y. Times, 7 Oct. 2021, www.nytimes.com/2021/10/07/us/politics/debt-ceiling-senate.html.

Senator Chuck Schumer of New York, the majority leader, announced that he reached an agreement with Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the minority leader, to raise the federal borrowing limit through early December. “We have reached agreement to extend the debt ceiling through early December, and it’s our hope that we can get this done as soon as today.” “Republican and Democratic members and staff negotiated through the night in good faith. The pathway our Democratic colleagues have accepted will spare the American people any near-term crisis.” Video player loading Senator Chuck Schumer of New York, the majority leader, announced that he reached an agreement with Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the minority leader, to raise the federal borrowing limit through early December.CreditCredit...T.J. Kirkpatrick for The New York Times Oct. 7, 2021Updated 3:17 p.m. ET WASHINGTON — Top Senate Democrats and Republicans said on Thursday that they had struck a deal to allow the debt ceiling to be raised through early December, temporarily staving off the threat of a first-ever default on the national debt after the G.O.P. agreed to temporarily drop its blockade of an increase. Senator Chuck Schumer, Democrat of New York and the majority leader, announced that he had reached an agreement with Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the minority leader, to clear the way for a vote as early as Thursday on a short-term extension, with potentially as few as 11 days left before a possible default. The movement came the day after Mr. McConnell partly backed down from his refusal to allow any such increase to move forward, offering a temporary reprieve as political pressure mounted to avoid being blamed for a fiscal calamity. “It’s our hope that we can get this done as soon as today,” Mr. Schumer said on Thursday morning on the Senate floor. But one day after Mr. McConnell indicated that Republicans would stand aside and allow the short-term increase to advance, he and his top deputies were laboring on Thursday to ensure his members will put aside their objections and clear the path for a vote. “We gotta see if the deal is done,” President Biden told reporters during a trip to Illinois. “I’m not sure of that yet.” The agreed-upon bill would boost the legal debt cap by $480 billion, which the Treasury Department estimates would be enough to allow the government to continue borrowing through at least Dec. 3. The current debt limit was reinstated at $28.4 trillion on Aug. 1, and the Treasury Department has been using so-called extraordinary measures to delay a breach of the borrowing cap since then. The agency estimated that the government would no longer be able to pay all of its bills by Oct. 18, once those fiscal accounting maneuvers were exhausted. Without congressional action before then, economists and lawmakers have warned of catastrophic economic consequences, including the U.S. government having to choose between making payments on the interest on its debt or sending out Social Security checks and other crucial assistance. The legislation under consideration on Thursday did not offer a hard deadline for when cash would run out, and it would not restart the Treasury Department’s ability to employ extraordinary measures, such as curbing certain government investments, a Treasury official said. Some Republicans said they thought the set dollar figure would ensure the limit would not be reached again until at least January. The actual “X-date” will be determined by tax revenues that the government receives and expenditures that it must make near the end of the year. Making such projections has been especially difficult this year because the pandemic relief programs that are in place have made it harder to predict when money is coming and going. “There is no way to predict with any precision exactly how much you would need to increase the debt limit by to get to a certain date,” said Shai Akabas, the director of economic policy at the Bipartisan Policy Center, an independent think tank. But in aiming for Dec. 3, the deal may position the next debt limit fight to overlap once again with negotiations over avoiding a government shutdown, as funding is set to lapse on that same day if Congress does not approve new spending legislation beforehand. Democrats hope nearly two additional months will give them space to focus on finalizing and enacting most of President Biden’s domestic agenda, including hammering out an array of intraparty disagreements over an expansive multi-trillion-dollar social safety net and climate change package. In raising the prospect of a stopgap extension on Wednesday, Mr. McConnell had said that Republicans would allow Democrats to use normal procedures to consider it. But that commitment appeared in doubt on Thursday afternoon, as Republicans privately objected and leaders toiled to line up the votes needed. Should even one senator demand a recorded vote, at least 10 Republicans would be needed to join every Democrat to muster the 60 votes needed to move the bill forward. Image The movement on debt ceiling negotiations came the day after Senator Mitch McConnell backed down partially from his refusal to allow any such increase to move forward. Credit...T.J. Kirkpatrick for The New York Times “We’re having conversations with our members and kind of figuring out where people are, but, as you might expect, this is not an easy one to whip,,” said Senator John Thune of South Dakota, the No. 2 Republican. He added that, “in the end we’ll be there, but it will be a painful birthing process.” Some Republicans were wary of angering their base by allowing the bill to move forward, especially after former President Donald J. Trump issued a statement on Wednesday that attacked Mr. McConnell for “folding to the Democrats.” Mr. Trump seemed to be pressuring Republicans to force a showdown in the face of a looming default, saying that Mr. McConnell had “all of the cards with the debt ceiling, it’s time to play the hand.” Even if Republicans clear the way to allow the measure to pass, it does nothing to address the crux of the partisan stalemate over the debt. Most notably, Republicans have not dropped their demand that Democrats ultimately use an arcane and time-consuming budget process known as reconciliation to lift the debt ceiling into next year. Democrats are currently using that process to steer around Republican opposition and push through a sprawling domestic package that would address climate change, expand the social safety net with more health care and education benefits, and increase taxes on the wealthy and corporations. “The pathway our Democratic colleagues have accepted will spare the American people any near-term crisis,” Mr. McConnell said on the Senate floor. The extension, he added, also means “there’ll be no question they’ll have plenty of time” to use the reconciliation process to approve a long-term increase.

#### Fighting insulin and Big Pharma requires enormous political capital because of lobbying and donations– especially with flakey moderates

Shure 8/5 Natalie Shure is a writer and researcher in Boston. Her work focuses on history, health, and politics. "Big Pharma’s Revolving Door Is Imperiling Democracy." New Republic, 5 Oct. 2021, newrepublic.com/article/163863/big-pharma-revolving-door-reconciliation.

Drug companies’ status as titanic moneymakers directly impedes the regulatory process, as their sizable paychecks constantly beckon employees away from government agencies and send them back into higher positions, forming one of the most cynical “revolving doors” in politics: One recent study found that a majority of workers who exited the Food and Drug Administration went to work for private drug companies, often for those whose lucrative drug approvals they personally oversaw. It also spins in the opposite direction, and on a bipartisan basis: A current White House counselor, as well as Trump’s HHS secretary, both spent much of their careers working for Eli Lilly, the most notorious insulin price-gouger. And while the go-to argument of the pharmaceutical industry’s P.R. outfits is that they need all of this cash to facilitate innovation, the real world implications of the profit-driven system are far less rosy. Too often, what these companies are “innovating” is new ways to circumvent patent law—like making superficial changes to a drug to buy more years of sales exclusivity or suing the pants off would-be generic competitors. Knowing they can afford to recircuit the regulatory process to bring to market drugs that add practically nothing to the existing pool, they have little reason to bother trying something new instead. As drug-pricing experts Aaron Kesselheim and Jerry Avron recently explained for The Washington Post, “Paying any amount a manufacturer demands creates incentives to produce lucrative products that involve less financial risk because they continue down well-trod biochemical pathways or provide only incremental changes to existing medicines.” And that’s not even to mention the most devastating impact of soaring drug prices, which of course isn’t on federal budgets but on patients themselves, who struggle to pay for the drugs they’re prescribed and routinely skip using the medicines they need because the costs are too high. It’s no surprise that drug pricing is so hard to solve. The immense power of the pharmaceutical industry keeps these prices artificially inflated, and those profits fund knock-down-drag-out fights against change—as well as deterring politicians from spending political capital hitting back. Things have finally gotten bad enough that the overwhelming majority of Democrats are unified in their intent to do something about it, but a few with majority-breaking power have nevertheless made the calculation that it better serves their interests to side with capital than against it. It’s natural to assume that this is Kyrsten Sinema’s endgame: After several years in politics, she knows damn well that catering to business rather than the American people can be an awfully lucrative gig, particularly when the only downside of pissing off the voters who sent you to Washington is walking through that constantly revolving door, straight into one of any number of industries to whom you sold out your constituents.

#### Pushing the plan takes time, energy, and political capital away from domestic legislation – big pharma and EU allies

Bhadrakumar 5/9 M K Bhadrakumar is a former Indian diplomat. "Biden’s talk of vaccine IP waiver is political theater." Asia Times, May 9, 2021, asiatimes.com/2021/05/bidens-talk-of-vaccine-ip-waiver-is-political-theater.

On the other hand, Biden, whose political life of half a century was largely spent in the US Congress, is well aware of the awesome clout of the pharmaceutical companies in American politics. From that lobby’s perspective, the patent waiver “amounts to the expropriation of the property of the pharmaceutical companies whose innovation and financial investments made the development of Covid-19 vaccines possible in the first place,” as a senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security puts it. The US pharmaceutical industry and congressional Republicans have already gone on the offensive blasting Biden’s announcement, saying it undermines incentives for American innovation. Besides, the argument goes, even with the patent waiver, vaccine manufacturing is a complex process and is not like simply flipping a switch. Senator Richard Burr, the top Republican on the US Senate Health Committee, denounced Biden’s decision. “Intellectual property protections are part of the reason we have these life-saving products,” he said. “Stripping these protections only ensures we won’t have the vaccines or treatments we need when the next pandemic occurs.” The Republican senators backed by Republican Study Committee chairman Jim Banks propose to introduce legislation to block the move. Clearly, Biden would rather spend his political capital on getting the necessary legislation through Congress to advance his domestic reform agenda rather than spend time and energy to take on the pharmaceutical industry to burnish his image as a good Samaritan on the world stage. Conceivably, Biden could be counting on the “text-based negotiations” at the WTO dragging on for months, if not years, without reaching anywhere. The US support for the waiver could even be a tactic to persuade pharmaceutical firms to back less drastic steps like sharing technology and expanding joint ventures to boost global production quickly. So far Covid-19 vaccines have been distributed primarily to the wealthy countries that developed them, while the pandemic sweeps through poorer ones such as India, and the real goal is, after all, expanded vaccine distribution. Biden is well aware that there will be huge opposition to the TRIPS waiver from the United States’ European allies as well. The British press has reported that the UK has been in closed-door talks at the World Trade Organization in recent months along with the likes of Australia, Canada, Japan, Norway, Singapore, the European Union and the US, who all opposed the idea.

#### Infrastructure package is sufficient, necessary, and the last opportunity to solve climate change – extinction

Leber 10/7 Leber, Rebecca. Rebecca Leber covers climate change for Vox. Before joining Vox, she was an environmental reporter at Mother Jones, where her investigations exposed government corruption and fossil fuel industry disinformation. She has worked as a staff writer at Grist, The New Republic, and ThinkProgress. A dozen more outlets have published her work over her decade as a climate journalist. "A last chance for US climate action: Democrats’ Build Back Better and infrastructure bills." Vox, 7 Oct. 2021, www.vox.com/22685920/democrats-infrastructure-build-back-better-climate-change.

The United States — the largest carbon polluter in history — is closer than it’s ever been to taking sweeping and lasting action on the climate crisis. The bad news is that if Democrats can’t pull it off, they may never get another opportunity like this — and the planet certainly won’t. Democratic leaders are trying to pass two major pieces of legislation — the $1 trillion bipartisan infrastructure bill and the up to $3.5 trillion Build Back Better Act — that they say can slash US pollution by up to 45 percent in the coming decade. In the outlined Build Back Better Act, Congress would flex its power to transform the electricity sector so that it runs on mostly clean energy, steer the transportation sector toward electric vehicles, and finally take action on methane pollution, one of the most harmful greenhouse gases. But there have been many recent moments when the precarious dealmaking in Congress seemed close to falling apart. One of the biggest sticking points has been with West Virginia Sen. Joe Manchin, who has questioned the party’s approach to passing both bills simultaneously. “What’s the urgency that we have?” Manchin asked on CNN’s State of the Union in late September. In part because of Manchin’s opposition, even progressive leaders have begun to manage expectations, signaling the ultimate bill will be less ambitious. Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont suggested that the $3.5 trillion figure would see some “give and take.” The package is likely to shrink to $2.3 trillion or less, the New York Times reported on Wednesday. So what is the urgency? Democrats only have one year before midterm elections could take away their narrow majorities in the House and Senate. That would leave them powerless to pass any legislation without help from Republicans. At the same time, the planet faces a rapidly closing window to avert the worst catastrophes of global warming. Every fraction of a degree will translate into lives and livelihoods lost. The world can’t afford another decade of American inaction, and what Congress does next will help determine the future of the climate. A last chance for Democrats Historically, the president’s party loses seats in Congress in midterm elections. Next November, Democrats could lose their narrow control of Congress if they lose even one Senate seat or more than a few House seats. “The middle of that Venn diagram — when we have leaders who care about science and we still have that window of opportunity — is now,” said Lena Moffitt, campaign director at the climate advocacy group Evergreen Action. Democrats in Congress are also relying on a roughly once-a-year process, known as budget reconciliation, to try and push the Build Back Better Act through the Senate. Reconciliation allows them to pass a budget with a simple majority, instead of the 60 votes that are usually required in the Senate. There might not be time or political will to make a similar move in 2022. And some Democrats remain unwilling to eliminate the Senate filibuster, which is the other way they could pass progressive policies. In short, if the historical pattern holds, Democrats may not get another chance under President Biden — or even this decade — to take serious action on climate. Some Republicans have been hinting at taking climate change more seriously, but much of the party’s leadership continues to downplay and deny climate science. The next time the US has an opening like this, climate change will likely be dramatically worse — and that much harder to stop. A flooded street of shops at night reflecting the lights in the water. Hurricane Ida caused record flooding in New Jersey in September. Climate change is already intensifying extreme weather such as tropical storms and heat waves. Anadolu Agency via Getty Images The best chance for the global climate Climate scientists have warned that once the atmosphere warms more than 1.5 degrees Celsius, we will live in a drastically changed world. If countries, corporations, and individuals don’t take immediate action to reduce pollution, the world may hit that grim milestone in just 10 years. Over the long term, if the world continues on its current polluting path, the world will warm more than double that amount, risking catastrophes humanity has never had to confront. The window to chart a new course is rapidly closing. And the world’s “last, best chance” to take decisive collective action is less than a month away, as John Kerry, who serves as President Biden’s climate envoy, has said. In early November, world governments will gather in Glasgow for the United Nations climate conference, COP26. Following up on the Paris climate accord, countries will pledge more ambitious pollution targets and tackle the challenge of financing a worldwide transition to clean energy. The US bears the most responsibility of any country for global warming, having released 20 percent of the world’s greenhouse pollution since 1850. Today, the country ranks second in emissions behind China. But the US also has the power to magnify its impact if it leads by example, or if it flexes its influence on the global economic system, for example by affecting global prices of fossil fuels by ending government subsidies. Climate experts say progress at the COP26 conference depends on the United States proving it can do its part, for symbolic as well as practical reasons. This is the first year the US officially returns to global negotiations after former President Donald Trump withdrew the country from the Paris climate accord. Now, Biden has to lead by example by showing that the country can swiftly change direction for good, demonstrating progress on its national pledge of cutting emissions 50 to 52 percent by 2030. “There is this sense of exhaustion about how long is it going to take for one of the biggest emitters in the world to do its fair share,” said Rachel Cleetus, the clean energy policy director at the Union of Concerned Scientists. It’s unclear whether Congress will deliver on climate-change legislation by the time the international community meets in Glasgow. But any steps forward would send “a very important signal that can really help catalyze more ambition from other countries,” Cleetus said.

# The Aff

## Framing

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing. That means that you should preserve life and justifies utilitarianism

#### Existential threats outweigh:

#### Extinction o/ws under any framework, even under moral uncertainty – infinite future generations

Pummer 15 — (Theron Pummer, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford, “Moral Agreement on Saving the World“, Practical Ethics University of Oxford, 5-18-2015, Available Online at http://blog.practicalethics.ox.ac.uk/2015/05/moral-agreement-on-saving-the-world/, accessed 7-2-2018, HKR-AM) \*\*we do not endorse ableist language=

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

#### A] Even the most conservative estimates prove reducing existential risk outweighs all other impacts, regardless of probability – actively prioritize our calculus since you are cognitively biased against it

Whittlestone 17 – (Jess Whittlestone, PhD in Behavioural Science and has worked as a policy consultant for government, specialising in security and foreign policy. She also has experience as a freelance journalist for a number of online magazines, including Quartz, Vox, and Aeon. Before her PhD, she studied Maths and Philosophy at Oxford, and played a key role in developing 80,000 Hours' coaching process and research. Currently, Jess is a Postdoctoral Research Associate at the Leverhulme Centre for the Future of Intelligence at Cambridge, “The Long-Term Future”, Effective Altruism, 11-16-17, Available Online at <https://www.effectivealtruism.org/articles/cause-profile-long-run-future/>, accessed 12-4-18, HKR-AM)

The number of people alive today pales in comparison to the number who could exist in the future. It may therefore be extremely important to ensure that human civilization flourishes far into the future, enjoying fulfilling lives free of suffering.

There are a number of ways we might work to ensure a positive future for humanity. We could work to better understand and prevent extinction risks - catastrophic events that have the potential to destroy all life on this planet.[1] We may want to focus on the broader category of existential risks- events that could dramatically and irreversibly curtail humanity’s potential.[2] Or we might focus on increasing the chance that the lives of our descendants are positive in other ways: for example, improving democracy or the ability of institutions to make good decisions.

Attempts to shape the long-term future seem highly neglected relative to the problems we face today. There are fewer incentives to address longer-term problems, and they can also be harder for us to take seriously.

It is, of course, hard to be certain about the impact of our actions on the very long-term future. However, it does seem that there are things we can do - and given the vast scale we are talking about, these actions could therefore have an enormous impact in expectation.

This profile sets out why you might want to focus your altruistic efforts on the long-term future - and why you might not. You may be particularly inclined to focus on this if you think we face serious existential threats in the next century, and if you’re comfortable accepting a reasonable amount of uncertainty about the impact you are having, especially in the short-term.

The case for the long-term future as a target of altruism

The case for focusing on the long-term future can be summarised as follows:

The long-term future has enormous potential for good or evil: our descendants could live for billions or trillions of years, and have very high-quality lives;

It seems likely there are things we can do today that will affect the long-term future in non-negligible ways;

Possible ways of shaping the long-term future are currently highly neglected by individuals and society;

Given points 1 to 3 above, actions aimed at shaping the long-term future seem to have extremely high expected value, higher than any actions aiming for more near-term benefits.

Below we discuss each part of this argument in more detail.

The long-term future has enormous potential

Civilisation could continue for a billion years, until the Earth becomes uninhabitable.[3] It’s hard to say how likely this is, but it certainly seems plausible - and putting less than, say, a 1% chance on this possibility seems overconfident.[4] You may disagree that 1% is a reasonable lower bound here, but changing the figure by an order of magnitude or two would still yield an extremely impressive result. And even if civilisation only survives for another million years, that still amounts to another ~50,000 generations of people, i.e. trillions of future lives.[5]

If our descendants survive for long enough, then they are likely to advance in ways we cannot currently imagine - even someone living a few hundred years ago could not possibly have imagined the technological advances we’ve made today. It is possible they might even develop technology enabling them to reach and colonise planets outside our solar system, and survive well beyond a billion years.[6]

Let’s say that if we survive until the end of the Earth’s lifespan, there is a 1% chance of space colonisation. This would make the overall probability of survival beyond Earth 1 in 10,000 (1% chance of surviving to a billion years, multiplied by a 1% chance of surviving further given that). This sounds incredibly low, but suppose that space colonisation could allow our descendants to survive up to 100 trillion years[7]. This suggests we could have up to 1/10,000 x 100 trillion years = 10 billion expected years of civilisation ahead of us.

If we expect life in the future to be, on average, about as good as the present, then this would make the whole of the future about 100 million times more important than everything that has happened in the last 100 years. In fact, it seems like there could be more people in the future with better lives than those living today: economic, social, and technological progress could enable us to cure diseases, lift people out of poverty, and better solve other problems. It also seems possible that people in the future will be more altruistic than people alive today[8] - which also makes it more likely that they will be motivated to create a happy and valuable world.

However, it’s precisely because of this enormous potential that it’s so important to ensure that things go as well as possible. The loss of potential would be enormous if we end up on a negative trajectory. It could result in a great deal of suffering or the end of life.[9] And just as the potential to solve many of the world’s problems is growing, threats seem to be growing too. In particular, advanced technologies and increasing interconnectedness pose great risks.[10]

There are things we can do today that could affect the long-term future

There are a number of things we could work on today that seem likely to influence the long-term future:

Reducing extinction risks: We could reduce the risk of catastrophic climate change by putting in place laws and regulations to cut carbon emissions. We could reduce the risks from new technologies by investing in research to ensure their safety. Alternatively, we could work to improve global cooperation so that we are better able to deal with unforeseen risks that might arise.

Changing the values of a civilisation: Values tend to be stable in societies,[11] so attempts to shift values, whilst difficult, could have long-lasting effects. Some forms of value change, like increasing altruism, seem robustly good, and may be a way of realizing the very best possible futures. However, spreading poorly considered values could be harmful.

Reducing suffering risks: Historically, technological advances have enabled great welfare improvements (e.g. through modern agriculture and medicine), but also some of the greatest sources of present-day suffering (e.g. factory farming). To prevent the worst risks from new technologies, we could improve global cooperation and work on specific problems like preventing worst-case outcomes from artificial intelligence.

“Speeding up” development: Boosting technological innovation or scientific progress could have a lasting “speed up” effect on the entire future, making all future benefits happen slightly earlier than they otherwise would have. Curing a disease just a few years earlier could save millions of lives, for example. (That said, it’s not clear whether speeding up development is good or bad for existential risk - developing new technologies faster might help us to mitigate certain threats, but pose new risks of their own.)

Ripple effects of our ordinary actions: Improvements in health not only benefit individuals directly but allow them to be more economically successful, meaning that society and other individuals have to invest less in supporting them. In aggregate, this could easily have substantial knock-on effects on the productivity of society, which could affect the future.

Other ways we might create positive trajectory changes: These include improving education, science, and political systems.

Paul Christiano also points out that even if opportunities to shape the long-term future with any degree of certainty do not exist today, they may well exist in the future. Investing in our own current capacity could have an indirect but large impact by improving our ability to take such opportunities when they do arise. Similarly, we can do research today to learn more about how we might be able to impact the long-term future.

The long-term future is neglected, especially relative to its importance

Attempts to shape the long-term future are neglected by individuals, organisations and governments.

One reason is that there is little incentive to focus on far-off, uncertain issues compared to more certain, immediate ones. As 80,000 Hours put it, “Future generations matter, but they can’t vote, they can’t buy things, they can’t stand up for their interests.”

Problems faced by future generations are also more uncertain and more abstract, making it harder for us to care about them. There is a well-established phenomenon called temporal discounting, which means that we tend to give less weight to outcomes that are far in the future. This may explain our tendency to neglect long-term risks and problems. For example, it’s a large part of why we seem to have such difficulty tackling climate change.

#### [b] Gateway issue - we need to be alive to assign value and debate competing moral theories- extinction literally ends the debate on “ought” [c] moral theories were formulated prior to the Anthropocene and human capacity for collective death so they cannot be relied on in situations of existential risk [d] no coherent moral theory can allow for extinction because it means the end of value

#### c) War worsens structural inequalities – a] takes away valuable resources to combat issues like economic and social injustice b] war falls the hardest on those who can’t protect themselves – especially nuclear war c] those who fight war are more likely to be worse off socially – aff ballot actively consigns the oppressed to fight for the state d] war kills everyone – death means we literally cannot fight injustice

#### If we win extinction first then we win the debate because a risk of our disad should ow/

#### No new 1ar framing cards or justifications – they had a burden to have it in the 1AC

### Their FW answers

### AT: 1 and 2

#### Need to answer our specific scenarios – blanket assertions of threat exaggeration lead us to underestimate legitimate impacts, this is the logic of people saying warming isn’t that big of a deal

#### The structure of debate demands you assign equal weight – anything else is a moral hazard that justifies judge intervention

#### This card is in the context of far-off futures – that’s distinct from causal claims, which means our DA’s are much closer to what the 1AC does than this author is referring to

#### Black swans equally apply to them since you cant predict anything

### AT: 3/ Actor Spec

#### Non-sequitir – it’s obviously also an obligation of the USFG to prevent all its citizens from dying from disease, util is consequentialism so we apply

### AT: 4/Kessler

#### Why probability first? If I have a 100% risk of dropping my pen making a dent in the floor, should we prefer that over a large scale existential threat? Their arguments just don’t make sense! 1% risk doesn’t collapse – if theres truly 0 risk of the da then you can vote aff but we will win some risk. Their example is about dying while driving, but you are one out of 7 billion people in the world so their arguments are just wrong.

### AT: 5/Karnofsky

#### Karnofsky doesn’t make any sense – what does it mean to be cluster based? What does it mean to have a sequence? Their card is just vague philosophical posturing that doesn’t address the root of the issue which is that probability is irrelevant since existential threats ow/. Their card does not talk about that so we subsume their offense because you can weigh between probabilities.

### AT 6/Moral Uncertantiy

#### Util literally is a moral uncertainty – they literally read a card FOR us that indicates utilitarianism is good since we should prevent consequences – thank you for the auto neg ballot. Equality means we should prevent death

### AT 7/Curry

#### This is in the context of a kritik which we are not reading, so they cant go for this as an answer to util BUT they said we should deal with consequences which we agree with! Thank you for reading that evidence for us

### AT 8/Lexical Prereq

#### Exactly! Death is bad which is our argument – they thought we were gonna read philosophy but we didn’t so these arguments all flow neg! – if its true that threats to bodily security preclude moral actors to act upon moral theories, that means death ow/s

### AT 9/Theory first

#### It’s GG here. They read “prefer consequentialism.” Consequentialism indicates we should prevent death at any costs which is our argument. That means we will concede the justifications for consequences because consequentalism is good.

#### At the end of the day they’ve read structural violence framing but also consequentalism justifications which indicates that extinction is bad so they contradicted themselves – we will concede their consequentialism justifications which means extinction ow/s and none of the aff matters because it doesn’t spill to extinction

#### 

## Advantage

### 1NC – Insulin

#### Here is a top level OV of the aff and why you should automatically vote neg. Their aff is really just not great and a lot of the cards are mishighlighted and really don’t say anything!

#### The biohacking stuff –

#### 1] Nonunique since people would already make their own insulin if they had to – no reason they’d care about IP if it’s life or death

#### 2] Not safe to have people developing their own insulin – obviously lowers the standard of care and makes harm more likely

#### 3] Their ev says IP isn’t necessarily an issue and can be evaded – I am going to READ their card rehighlighted in blue

1AC Peccoud et al 18 Jenna E. Gallegos [],1 Christopher Boyer,2 Eleanore Pauwels,3 Warren A. Kaplan,4 and Jean Peccoud [Prof. Jean Peccoud joined the department in January 2016 as the Abell chair in synthetic biology]1,\*, December 18, “The Open Insulin Project: A Case Study for ‘Biohacked’ Medicines””, Trends in Biotechnology Vol 36 No. 12, <https://www.cell.com/trends/biotechnology/pdf/S0167-7799(18)30200-2.pdf> DD AG

Biohacked insulin will face different intellectual property barriers depending on the distribution model. If the Open Insulin Project succeeds in developing and releasing a protocol for insulin manufacturing, and that protocol is adapted for personal use (as epinephrine auto-injectors have been), intellectual property will likely not be a substantial obstacle. Personal use of ‘home-brewed insulin’ would not trigger any patent considerations in most European countries, as the exclusive exploitation rights granted by a patent are restricted to commercial exploitation. In Europe, a private person who builds a patented invention and/or uses a patented method in her own home for her own personal goals generally cannot infringe on a patent. The reasoning behind this is that such a situation cannot harm the patent holder. In the US, the law is stricter, and it forbids anyone from making, using, or experimenting with an invention, even when the use is not commercial, except in very limited cases [26]. Practically speaking, however, since patent infringement lawsuits are very expensive, and it is Difficult to track restricted use in private, an individual would rarely, if ever, be prosecuted for using an invention in her own home. In the case of insulin, the safety ramifications of this scenario are obvious and will be discussed more thoroughly in the following sections.

Any other innovation ecosystem for insulin (e.g., ‘magistral’ production or technology transfer to a generic company) may run afoul of patents on the molecule and the production process, provided such patents exist. We note that there are plenty of patent applications filed for various ‘next generation’ insulin analogs, methods of making them, and methods of using them [27]. However, patents protecting the amino acid sequence of unmodified human insulin itself and of some recently off-patent insulin analogues are not a major barrier to the market introduction of affordable insulin. Patents protecting production methods of insulin are a more likely intellectual property obstacle.

#### I will line by line the specific aff cards here:

#### 1st Peccoud evidence is wrong – its in the context of 2002 to 2013 and doesn’t take into account market shifts.

#### Greene evidence is bad – their evidence just talks about standard and analogue lead which doesn’t make sense about obsolete insulin

#### 2nd peccoud evidence – while it might be true that prices increase the afs reduction doesn’t make it accessible

#### Scott evidence – they enforce the aff through the Affordable Drug Manufacturing Act which is untopical and extra T which destroys neg ground and explodes limits – that prevents me from reading good arguments against that. Regardless, they just speculate on “fair” prices but don’t explain what that would look like!

#### 3rd peccoud evidence - they will likely go for this as an answer to innovation DA, but none of their card subsumes anything about drug innovation. Their card doesn’t talk about market shifts writ large which is our internal link that they go for.