### Underview 1

#### We aren’t reading a k so none of this applies

### Underview 2

#### All they are saying is that their impact is big – there is no warrant or justification or how we are supposed to implement a high standard of proof. All this says is that the neg’s life should be harder bc they have done what the aff should do

#### This assumes all cards are independent instead of a part of a link chain. This is not how probabilities work in the real world (basically saying that the prob of a coin landing heads is 1% bc of wind and speed when it is just 50%)

#### Extinction first might not be best when deciding dinner but in world health crisis its not that irrelevant – its context dependent

#### Cross apply b answers this is just compound probability part 2

#### The case is the exception

### Framing

#### Double bind: either this is just about extinction first then we can still use util or it is about util being problematic then we can’t weigh the aff bc the aff is still util just about which live, so the aff would have no offense

#### Extinction outweighs---it’s the upmost moral evil and disavowal of the risk makes it more likely.

Burns 2017 (Elizabeth Finneron-Burns is a Teaching Fellow at the University of Warwick and an Affiliated Researcher at the Institute for Futures Studies in Stockholm, What’s wrong with human extinction?, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00455091.2016.1278150?needAccess=true>, Canadian Journal of Philosophy, 2017)

Many, though certainly not all, people might believe that it would be wrong to bring about the end of the human species, and the reasons given for this belief are various. I begin by considering four reasons that could be given against the moral permissibility of human extinction. I will argue that only those reasons that impact the people who exist at the time that the extinction or the knowledge of the upcoming extinction occurs, can explain its wrongness. I use this conclusion to then consider in which cases human extinction would be morally permissible or impermissible, arguing that there is only a small class of cases in which it would not be wrong to cause the extinction of the human race or allow it to happen. 2.1. It would prevent the existence of very many happy people One reason of human extinction might be considered to be wrong lies in the value of human life itself. The thought here might be that it is a good thing for people to exist and enjoy happy lives and extinction would deprive more people of enjoying this good. The ‘good’ in this case could be understood in at least two ways. According to the first, one might believe that you benefit a person by bringing them into existence, or at least, that it is good for that person that they come to exist. The second view might hold that if humans were to go extinct, the utility foregone by the billions (or more) of people who could have lived but will now never get that opportunity, renders allowing human extinction to take place an incidence of wrongdoing. An example of this view can be found in two quotes from an Effective Altruism blog post by Peter Singer, Nick Beckstead and Matt Wage: One very bad thing about human extinction would be that billions of people would likely die painful deaths. But in our view, this is by far not the worst thing about human extinction. The worst thing about human extinction is that there would be no future generations. Since there could be so many generations in our future, the value of all those generations together greatly exceeds the value of the current generation. (Beckstead, Singer, and Wage 2013) The authors are making two claims. The first is that there is value in human life and also something valuable about creating future people which gives us a reason to do so; furthermore, it would be a very bad thing if we did not do so. The second is that, not only would it be a bad thing for there to be no future people, but it would actually be the worst thing about extinction. Since happy human lives have value, and the number of potential people who could ever exist is far greater than the number of people who exist at any one time, even if the extinction were brought about through the painful deaths of currently existing people, the former’s loss would be greater than the latter’s. Both claims are assuming that there is an intrinsic value in the existence of potential human life. The second claim makes the further assumption that the forgone value of the potential lives that could be lived is greater than the disvalue that would be accrued by people existing at the time of the extinction through suffering from painful and/or premature deaths. The best-known author of the post, Peter Singer is a prominent utilitarian, so it is not surprising that he would lament the potential lack of future human lives per se. However, it is not just utilitarians who share this view, even if implicitly. Indeed, other philosophers also seem to imply that they share the intuition that there is just something wrong with causing or failing to prevent the extinction of the human species such that we prevent more ‘people’ from having the ‘opportunity to exist’. Stephen Gardiner (2009) and Martin O’Neill (personal correspondence), both sympathetic to contract theory, for example, also find it intuitive that we should want more generations to have the opportunity to exist, assuming that they have worth-living lives, and I find it plausible to think that many other people (philosophers and non-philosophers alike) probably share this intuition. When we talk about future lives being ‘prevented’, we are saying that a possible person or a set of possible people who could potentially have existed will now never actually come to exist. To say that it is wrong to prevent people from existing could either mean that a possible person could reasonably reject a principle that permitted us not to create them, or that the foregone value of their lives provides a reason for rejecting any principle that permits extinction. To make the first claim we would have to argue that a possible person could reasonably reject any principle that prevented their existence on the grounds that it prevented them in particular from existing. However, this is implausible for two reasons. First, we can only wrong someone who did, does or will actually exist because wronging involves failing to take a person’s interests into account. When considering the permissibility of a principle allowing us not to create Person X, we cannot take X’s interest in being created into account because X will not exist if we follow the principle. By considering the standpoint of a person in our deliberations we consider the burdens they will have to bear as a result of the principle. In this case, there is no one who will bear any burdens since if the principle is followed (that is, if we do not create X), X will not exist to bear any burdens. So, only people who do/will actually exist can bear the brunt of a principle, and therefore occupy a standpoint that is owed justification. Second, existence is not an interest at all and a possible person is not disadvantaged by not being caused to exist. Rather than being an interest, it is a necessary requirement in order to have interests. Rivka Weinberg describes it as ‘neutral’ because causing a person to exist is to create a subject who can have interests; existence is not an interest itself.3 In order to be disadvantaged, there must be some detrimental effect on your interests. However, without existence, a person does not have any interests so they cannot be disadvantaged by being kept out of existence. But, as Weinberg points out, ‘never having interests itself could not be contrary to people’s interests since without interest bearers, there can be no ‘they’ for it to be bad for’ (Weinberg 2008, 13). So, a principle that results in some possible people never becoming actual does not impose any costs on those ‘people’ because nobody is disadvantaged by not coming into existence.4 It therefore seems that it cannot be wrong to fail to bring particular people into existence. This would mean that no one acts wrongly when they fail to create another person. Writ large, it would also not be wrong if everybody decided to exercise their prerogative not to create new people and potentially, by consequence, allow human extinction. One might respond here by saying that although it may be permissible for one person to fail to create a new person, it is not permissible if everyone chooses to do so because human lives have value and allowing human extinction would be to forgo a huge amount of value in the world. This takes us to the second way of understanding the potential wrongness of preventing people from existing — the foregone value of a life provides a reason for rejecting any principle that prevents it. One possible reply to this claim turns on the fact that many philosophers acknowledge that the only, or at least the best, way to think about the value of (individual or groups of) possible people’s lives is in impersonal terms (Parfit 1984; Reiman 2007; McMahan 2009). Jeff McMahan, for example, writes ‘at the time of one’s choice there is no one who exists or will exist independently of that choice for whose sake one could be acting in causing him or her to exist … it seems therefore that any reason to cause or not to cause an individual to exist … is best considered an impersonal rather than individual-affecting reason’ (McMahan 2009, 52). Another reply along similar lines would be to appeal to the value that is lost or at least foregone when we fail to bring into existence a next (or several next) generations of people with worth-living lives. Since ex hypothesi worth-living lives have positive value, it is better to create more such lives and worse to create fewer. Human extinction by definition is the creation of no future lives and would ‘deprive’ billions of ‘people’ of the opportunity to live worth-living lives. This might reduce the amount of value in the world at the time of the extinction (by killing already existing people), but it would also prevent a much vaster amount of value in the future (by failing to create more people). Both replies depend on the impersonal value of human life. However, recall that in contractualism impersonal values are not on their own grounds for reasonably rejecting principles. Scanlon himself says that although we have a strong reason not to destroy existing human lives, this reason ‘does not flow from the thought that it is a good thing for there to be more human life rather than less’ (104). In contractualism, something cannot be wrong unless there is an impact on a person. Thus, neither the impersonal value of creating a particular person nor the impersonal value of human life writ large could on its own provide a reason for rejecting a principle permitting human extinction. It seems therefore that the fact that extinction would deprive future people of the opportunity to live worth-living lives (either by failing to create either particular future people or future people in general) cannot provide us with a reason to consider human extinction to be wrong. Although the lost value of these ‘lives’ itself cannot be the reason explaining the wrongness of extinction, it is possible the knowledge of this loss might create a personal reason for some existing people. I will consider this possibility later on in section (d). But first I move to the second reason human extinction might be wrong per se. 2.2. It would mean the loss of the only known form of intelligent life and all civilization and intellectual progress would be lost A second reason we might think it would be wrong to cause human extinction is the loss that would occur of the only (known) form of rational life and the knowledge and civilization that that form of life has created. One thought here could be that just as some might consider it wrong to destroy an individual human heritage monument like the Sphinx, it would also be wrong if the advances made by humans over the past few millennia were lost or prevented from progressing. A related argument is made by those who feel that there is something special about humans’ capacity for rationality which is valuable in itself. Since humans are the only intelligent life that we know of, it would be a loss, in itself, to the world for that to end. I admit that I struggle to fully appreciate this thought. It seems to me that Henry Sidgwick was correct in thinking that these things are only important insofar as they are important to humans (Sidgwick 1874, I.IX.4).5 If there is no form of intelligent life in the future, who would there be to lament its loss since intelligent life is the only form of life capable of appreciating intelligence? Similarly, if there is no one with the rational capacity to appreciate historic monuments and civil progress, who would there be to be negatively affected or even notice the loss?6 However, even if there is nothing special about human rationality, just as some people try to prevent the extinction of nonhuman animal species, we might think that we ought also to prevent human extinction for the sake of biodiversity. The thought in this, as well as the earlier examples, must be that it would somehow be bad for the world if there were no more humans even though there would be no one for whom it is bad. This may be so but the only way to understand this reason is impersonally. Since we are concerned with wrongness rather than badness, we must ask whether something that impacts no one’s well-being, status or claims can be wrong. As we saw earlier, in the contractualist framework reasons must be personal rather than impersonal in order to provide grounds for reasonable rejection (Scanlon 1998, 218–223). Since the loss of civilization, intelligent life or biodiversity are per se impersonal reasons, there is no standpoint from which these reasons could be used to reasonably reject a principle that permitted extinction. Therefore, causing human extinction on the grounds of the loss of civilization, rational life or biodiversity would not be wrong. 2.3. Existing people would endure physical pain and/or painful and/or premature deaths Thinking about the ways in which human extinction might come about brings to the fore two more reasons it might be wrong. It could, for example, occur if all humans (or at least the critical number needed to be unable to replenish the population, leading to eventual extinction) underwent a sterilization procedure. Or perhaps it could come about due to anthropogenic climate change or a massive asteroid hitting the Earth and wiping out the species in the same way it did the dinosaurs millions of years ago. Each of these scenarios would involve significant physical and/or non-physical harms to existing people and their interests. Physically, people might suffer premature and possibly also painful deaths, for example. It is not hard to imagine examples in which the process of extinction could cause premature death. A nuclear winter that killed everyone or even just every woman under the age of 50 is a clear example of such a case. Obviously, some types of premature death themselves cannot be reasons to reject a principle. Every person dies eventually, sometimes earlier than the standard expected lifespan due to accidents or causes like spontaneously occurring incurable cancers. A cause such as disease is not a moral agent and therefore it cannot be wrong if it unavoidably kills a person prematurely. Scanlon says that the fact that a principle would reduce a person’s well-being gives that person a reason to reject the principle: ‘components of well-being figure prominently as grounds for reasonable rejection’ (Scanlon 1998, 214). However, it is not settled yet whether premature death is a setback to well-being. Some philosophers hold that death is a harm to the person who dies, whilst others argue that it is not.7 I will argue, however, that regardless of who is correct in that debate, being caused to die prematurely can be reason to reject a principle when it fails to show respect to the person as a rational agent. Scanlon says that recognizing others as rational beings with interests involves seeing reason to preserve life and prevent death: ‘appreciating the value of human life is primarily a matter of seeing human lives as something to be respected, where this involves seeing reasons not to destroy them, reasons to protect them, and reasons to want them to go well’ (Scanlon 1998, 104). The ‘respect for life’ in this case is a respect for the person living, not respect for human life in the abstract. This means that we can sometimes fail to protect human life without acting wrongfully if we still respect the person living. Scanlon gives the example of a person who faces a life of unending and extreme pain such that she wishes to end it by committing suicide. Scanlon does not think that the suicidal person shows a lack of respect for her own life by seeking to end it because the person whose life it is has no reason to want it to go on. This is important to note because it emphasizes the fact that the respect for human life is person-affecting. It is not wrong to murder because of the impersonal disvalue of death in general, but because taking someone’s life without their permission shows disrespect to that person. This supports its inclusion as a reason in the contractualist formula, regardless of what side ends up winning the ‘is death a harm?’ debate because even if death turns out not to harm the person who died, ending their life without their consent shows disrespect to that person. A person who could reject a principle permitting another to cause his or her premature death presumably does not wish to die at that time, or in that manner. Thus, if they are killed without their consent, their interests have not been taken into account, and they have a reason to reject the principle that allowed their premature death.8 This is as true in the case of death due to extinction as it is for death due to murder. However, physical pain may also be caused to existing people without killing them, but still resulting in human extinction. Imagine, for example, surgically removing everyone’s reproductive organs in order to prevent the creation of any future people. Another example could be a nuclear bomb that did not kill anyone, but did painfully render them infertile through illness or injury. These would be cases in which physical pain (through surgery or bombs) was inflicted on existing people and the extinction came about as a result of the painful incident rather than through death. Furthermore, one could imagine a situation in which a bomb (for example) killed enough people to cause extinction, but some people remained alive, but in terrible pain from injuries. It seems uncontroversial that the infliction of physical pain could be a reason to reject a principle. Although Scanlon says that an impact on well-being is not the only reason to reject principles, it plays a significant role, and indeed, most principles are likely to be rejected due to a negative impact on a person’s well-being, physical or otherwise. It may be queried here whether it is actually the involuntariness of the pain that is grounds for reasonable rejection rather than the physical pain itself because not all pain that a person suffers is involuntary. One can imagine acts that can cause physical pain that are not rejectable — base jumping or life-saving or improving surgery, for example. On the other hand, pushing someone off a cliff or cutting him with a scalpel against his will are clearly rejectable acts. The difference between the two cases is that in the former, the person having the pain inflicted has consented to that pain or risk of pain. My view is that they cannot be separated in these cases and it is involuntary physical pain that is the grounds for reasonable rejection. Thus, the fact that a principle would allow unwanted physical harm gives a person who would be subjected to that harm a reason to reject the principle. Of course the mere fact that a principle causes involuntary physical harm or premature death is not sufficient to declare that the principle is rejectable — there might be countervailing reasons. In the case of extinction, what countervailing reasons might be offered in favour of the involuntary physical pain/ death-inducing harm? One such reason that might be offered is that humans are a harm to the natural environment and that the world might be a better place if there were no humans in it. It could be that humans might rightfully be considered an all-things-considered hindrance to the world rather than a benefit to it given the fact that we have been largely responsible for the extinction of many species, pollution and, most recently, climate change which have all negatively affected the natural environment in ways we are only just beginning to understand. Thus, the fact that human extinction would improve the natural environment (or at least prevent it from degrading further), is a countervailing reason in favour of extinction to be weighed against the reasons held by humans who would experience physical pain or premature death. However, the good of the environment as described above is by definition not a personal reason. Just like the loss of rational life and civilization, therefore, it cannot be a reason on its own when determining what is wrong and countervail the strong personal reasons to avoid pain/death that is held by the people who would suffer from it.9 Every person existing at the time of the extinction would have a reason to reject that principle on the grounds of the physical pain they are being forced to endure against their will that could not be countervailed by impersonal considerations such as the negative impact humans may have on the earth. Therefore, a principle that permitted extinction to be accomplished in a way that caused involuntary physical pain or premature death could quite clearly be rejectable by existing people with no relevant countervailing reasons. This means that human extinction that came about in this way would be wrong. There are of course also additional reasons they could reject a similar principle which I now turn to address in the next section. 2.4. Existing people could endure non-physical harms I said earlier than the fact in itself that there would not be any future people is an impersonal reason and can therefore not be a reason to reject a principle permitting extinction. However, this impersonal reason could give rise to a personal reason that is admissible. So, the final important reason people might think that human extinction would be wrong is that there could be various deleterious psychological effects that would be endured by existing people having the knowledge that there would be no future generations. There are two main sources of this trauma, both arising from the knowledge that there will be no more people. The first relates to individual people and the undesired negative effect on well-being that would be experienced by those who would have wanted to have children. Whilst this is by no means universal, it is fair to say that a good proportion of people feel a strong pull towards reproduction and having their lineage continue in some way. Samuel Scheffler describes the pull towards reproduction as a ‘desire for a personalized relationship with the future’ (Scheffler 2012, 31). Reproducing is a widely held desire and the joys of parenthood are ones that many people wish to experience. For these people knowing that they would not have descendants (or that their descendants will endure painful and/or premature deaths) could create a sense of despair and pointlessness of life. Furthermore, the inability to reproduce and have your own children because of a principle/policy that prevents you (either through bans or physical interventions) would be a significant infringement of what we consider to be a basic right to control what happens to your body. For these reasons, knowing that you will have no descendants could cause significant psychological traumas or harms even if there were no associated physical harm. The second is a more general, higher level sense of hopelessness or despair that there will be no more humans and that your projects will end with you. Even those who did not feel a strong desire to procreate themselves might feel a sense of hopelessness that any projects or goals they have for the future would not be fulfilled. Many of the projects and goals we work towards during our lifetime are also at least partly future-oriented. Why bother continuing the search for a cure for cancer if either it will not be found within humans’ lifetime, and/or there will be no future people to benefit from it once it is found? Similar projects and goals that might lose their meaning when confronted with extinction include politics, artistic pursuits and even the type of philosophical work with which this paper is concerned. Even more extreme, through the words of the character Theo Faron, P.D. James says in his novel The Children of Men that ‘without the hope of posterity for our race if not for ourselves, without the assurance that we being dead yet live, all pleasures of the mind and senses sometimes seem to me no more than pathetic and crumbling defences shored up against our ruins’ (James 2006, 9). Even if James’ claim is a bit hyperbolic and all pleasures would not actually be lost, I agree with Scheffler in finding it not implausible that the knowledge that extinction was coming and that there would be no more people would have at least a general depressive effect on people’s motivation and confidence in the value of and joy in their activities (Scheffler 2012, 43). Both sources of psychological harm are personal reasons to reject a principle that permitted human extinction. Existing people could therefore reasonably reject the principle for either of these reasons. Psychological pain and the inability to pursue your personal projects, goals, and aims, are all acceptable reasons for rejecting principles in the contractualist framework. So too are infringements of rights and entitlements that we accept as important for people’s lives. These psychological reasons, then, are also valid reasons to reject principles that permitted or required human extinction.

# Manufacturing CP

### OFF

#### The United States federal government should commit to purchasing sufficient doses of COVID-19 vaccines to meet global demand and establish public-private partnerships to expand global vaccine manufacturing capacity.

#### Buying and exporting vaccines solves while avoiding the china DA.

Gianna **Gancia 21**, (IT, ID) is a member of Parliament’s Development Committee, “Why waiving patents on vaccines is not a good idea,” Parliament Magazine, 5-14-2021, https://www.theparliamentmagazine.eu/news/article/why-waiving-patents-on-vaccines-is-not-a-good-idea

In fact, there would be no incentive for pharmaceutical companies to conduct research, not only into COVID-19 (let's not forget that much still needs to be done to achieve an effective and minimally invasive therapeutic treatment in case of infection and severe symptoms) **but also for future pandemic crises that, in a globalised world, are unfortunately entirely predictable.** But the negative effects would not stop with pandemic crises. What would happen if one day, hopefully very near, an extremely effective anti-cancer drug was discovered by a pharmaceutical company? Would patents be suspended yet again? **It is obvious that investment in cancer drug research would be drastically reduced.** I strongly believe that the US position is short-sighted in this case, and to align with it would mean thwarting efforts to build an autonomous, strategic, and resilient European pharmaceutical sector. Such a decision would strongly disincentivise private investors and would effectively undermine the European sector's ability to be a world leader in research. We must remember that the United States has contributed very marginally to the export of vaccine doses, unlike the European Union which has exported 200 million doses, as many as the US has administered to its own citizens. Suspending the patents is a very hypocritical decision. If the United States really wants to help eradicate the virus from the world, the only thing they have to do is **heavily subsidise, with public money, the production of a large number of vaccines by their pharmaceutical companies**. “Giving” the patent to these countries is a cynical way of appearing good and humanitarian, without contributing in any way to actually helping them.

# China DA

### OFF

#### China is using vaccine diplomacy to cement global leadership – the plan reverses this

Purvaja **Modak 2**1, FDI Associate, “China’s Vaccine Diplomacy, the “Health Silk Road” and a Global Pledge,” Future Directions International, 7-15-2021, https://www.futuredirections.org.au/publication/chinas-vaccine-diplomacy-the-health-silk-road-and-a-global-pledge/

Since late 2020, China has promised vaccines to more than 80 countries under its “Health Silk Road” initiative, an emerging diplomatic initiative to promote health co-operation. Those rollouts have faced scepticism, since the data on clinical trials have not been released for scientists to assess the efficacy of the vaccines. Critics of China’s so-called “vaccine diplomacy” do not view its efforts as an altruistic gesture. While China has indeed donated vaccines to a few countries, the majority have had to purchase their supplies, in some instances using loans offered by China to do so. China’s “vaccine diplomacy” is underpinned by geopolitical motivations. According to an April 2021 report by Think Global Health, of the 56 countries to which China pledged doses, 55 were participants in the BRI. That is China’s way of ensuring that those countries will remain indebted to Beijing and will continue to support and allow Chinese infrastructure and connectivity projects on their territories. That initiative has a secondary goal: China is now trying to give its pharmaceutical industry, which has been criticised for having low efficacy rates and poor credibility, a degree of legitimacy. China wishes to take its Sinovac and Sinopharm vaccines around the world to change those perceptions. **To achieve its geopolitical objectives and regain its global standing, China has sought to provide its vaccines to countries of almost every continent**. As the tables below demonstrate, China has managed to penetrate many countries despite suspicion about the efficacy of the vaccines and opaque data on its clinical trials. China’s COVID-19 vaccines have been shipped to more than 60 countries for emergency use, according to an official of the Chinese Commerce Ministry. It has supplied its vaccines to five countries in India’s neighbourhood, to 27 African countries, twelve countries in Western and Central Asia, twelve more in South-East Asia and the Pacific, fifteen countries in Latin America and signed agreements to supply its vaccines to over twenty more countries. On 2 June 2021, China’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated that China had provided ‘more than 350 million doses’ of vaccines to the international community by that date.

#### That’s necessary to solve a litany of global problems.

Shen **Yamei 18**, Deputy Director and Associate Research Fellow of Department for American Studies, China Institute of International Studies, 1-9-2018, "Probing into the “Chinese Solution” for the Transformation of Global Governance," CAIFC, http://www.caifc.org.cn/en/content.aspx?id=4491

As the world is in a period of great development, transformation and adjustment, the international power comparison is undergoing profound changes, global governance is reshuffling and traditional governance concepts and models are confronted with challenges. The international community is expecting China to play a bigger role in global governance, which has given birth to the Chinese solution. A. To Lead the Transformation of the Global Governance System. **The “shortcomings” of the existing global governance system are prominent, which can hardly ensure global development. First, the traditional dominant forces are seriously imbalanced**. The US and Europe that used to dominate the global governance system have been beset with structural problems, with their economic development stalling, social contradictions intensifying, populism and secessionism rising, and states trapped in internal strife and differentiation. These countries have not fully reformed and adjusted themselves well, but rather pointed their fingers at globalization and resorted to retreat for self-insurance or were busy with their own affairs without any wish or ability to participate in global governance, which has encouraged the growth of “anti-globalization” trend into an interference factor to global governance. Second, the global governance mechanism is relatively lagging behind. Over the years of development, the strength of emerging economies has increased dramatically, which has substantially upset the international power structure, as the developing countries as a whole have made 80 percent of the contributions to global economic growth. These countries have expressed their appeal for new governance and begun policy coordination among themselves, which has initiated the transition of global governance form “Western governance” to “East-West joint governance”, but **the traditional governance mechanisms such as the World Bank, IMF and G7 failed to reflect the demand of the new pattern, in addition to their lack of representation and inclusiveness.** Third, the global governance rules are developing in a fragmented way, with governance deficits existing in some key areas. With the diversification and in-depth integration of international interests, the domain of global governance has continued to expand, with actors multiplying by folds and action intentions becoming complicated. As relevant efforts are usually temporary and limited to specific partners or issues, global governance driven by requests of “diversified governance” lacks systematic and comprehensive solutions. Since the beginning of this year, there have been risks of running into an acephalous state **in such key areas as global economic governance and climate change**. **Such emerging issues as nuclear security and international terrorism have suffered injustice because of power politics**. **The governance areas in deficit, such as cyber security, polar region and oceans, have “reversely forced” certain countries and organizations to respond hastily**. All of these have made the global governance system trapped in a dilemma and call urgently for a clear direction of advancement. B. To Innovate and Perfect the International Order. Currently, whether the developing countries or the Western countries of Europe and the US are greatly discontent with the existing international order as well as their appeals and motivation for changing the order are unprecedentedly strong. The US is the major creator and beneficiary of the existing hegemonic order, but it is now doubtful that it has gained much less than lost from the existing order, faced with the difficulties of global economic transformation and obsessed with economic despair and political dejection. Although the developing countries as represented by China acknowledge the positive role played by the post-war international order in safeguarding peace, boosting prosperity and promoting globalization, they criticize the existing order for lack of inclusiveness in politics and equality in economy, as well as double standard in security, believing it has failed to reflect the multi-polarization trend of the world and is an exclusive “circle club”. Therefore, there is much room for improvement. For China, to lead the transformation of the global governance system and international order not only supports the efforts of the developing countries to uphold multilateralism rather than unilateralism, advocate the rule of law rather than the law of the jungle and practice democracy rather than power politics in international relations, but also is an important subject concerning whether China could gain the discourse power and development space corresponding to its own strength and interests in the process of innovating and perfecting the framework of international order. C. To Promote Integration of the Eastern and Western Civilizations. Dialog among civilizations, which is the popular foundation for any country’s diplomatic proposals, runs like a trickle moistening things silently. Nevertheless, in the existing international system guided by the “Western-Centrism”, the Western civilization has always had the self-righteous superiority, conflicting with the interests and mentality of other countries and having failed to find the path to co-existing peacefully and harmoniously with other civilizations. **So to speak, many problems of today, including the growing gap in economic development between the developed and developing countries against the background of globalization, the Middle East trapped in chaos and disorder, the failure of Russia and Turkey to “integrate into the West”, etc., can be directly attributed to lack of exchanges, communication and integration among civilizations.** Since the 18th National Congress of CPC, Xi Jinping has raised the concept of “Chinese Dream” that reflects both Chinese values and China’s pursuit, re-introducing to the world the idea of “all living creatures grow together without harming one another and ways run parallel without interfering with one another”, which is the highest ideal in Chinese traditional culture, and striving to shape China into a force that counter-balance the Western civilization. He has also made solemn commitment that “we respect the diversity of civilizations …… cannot be puffed up with pride and depreciate other civilizations and nations”; “facing the people deeply trapped in misery and wars, we should have not only compassion and sympathy, but also responsibility and action …… do whatever we can to extend assistance to those people caught in predicament”, etc. China will rebalance the international pattern from a more inclusive civilization perspective and with more far-sighted strategic mindset, or at least correct the bisected or predominated world order so as to promote the parallel development of the Eastern and Western civilizations through mutual learning, integration and encouragement. D. To Pass on China’s Confidence. Only a short while ago, some Western countries had called for “China’s responsibility” and made it an inhibition to “regulate” China’s development orientation. Today, China has become a source of stability in an international situation full of uncertainties. Over the past 5 years, China has made outstanding contributions to the recovery of world economy under relatively great pressure of its own economic downturn. Encouraged by the “four confidences”, the whole of the Chinese society has burst out innovation vitality and produced innovation achievements, making people have more sense of gain and more optimistic about the national development prospect. It is the heroism of the ordinary Chinese to overcome difficulties and realize the ideal destiny that best explains China’s confidence. When this confidence is passed on in the field of diplomacy, it is expressed as: first, China’s posture is seen as more forging ahead and courageous to undertake responsibilities ---- proactively shaping the international agendas rather than passively accepting them; having clear-cut attitudes on international disputes rather than being equivocal; and extending international cooperation to comprehensive and dimensional development rather than based on the theory of “economy only”. In sum, China will actively seek understanding and support from other countries rather than imposing its will on others with clear-cut Chinese characteristics, Chinese style and Chinese manner. Second, China’s discourse is featured as a combination of inflexibility and yielding as well as magnanimous ---- combining the internationally recognized diplomatic principles with the excellent Chinese cultural traditions through digesting the Chinese and foreign humanistic classics assisted with philosophical speculations to make “China Brand, Chinese Voice and China’s Image get more and more recognized”. Third, the Chinese solution is more practical and intimate to people as well as emphasizes inclusive cooperation, as China is full of confidence to break the monopoly of the Western model on global development, “offering mankind a Chinese solution to explore a better social system”, and “providing a brand new option for the nations and peoples who are hoping both to speed up development and maintain independence”. II.Path Searching of the “Chinese Solution” for Global Governance Over the past years’ efforts, China has the ability to transform itself from “grasping the opportunity” for development to “creating opportunity” and “sharing opportunity” for common development, hoping to pass on the longing of the Chinese people for a better life to the people of other countries and promoting the development of the global governance system toward a more just and rational end. It has become the major power’s conscious commitment of China to lead the transformation of the global governance system in a profound way. A. To Construct the Theoretical System for Global Governance. The theoretical system of global governance has been the focus of the party central committee’s diplomatic theory innovation since the 18th National Congress of CPC as well as an important component of the theory of socialism with Chinese characteristics for a new era, which is not only the sublimation of China’s interaction with the world from “absorbing and learning” to “cooperation and mutual learning”, but also the cause why so many developing countries have turned from “learning from the West” to “exploring for treasures in the East”. In the past 5 years, the party central committee, based on precise interpretation of the world pattern today and serious reflection on the future development of mankind, has made a sincere call to the world for promoting the development of global governance system toward a more just and rational end, and proposed a series of new concepts and new strategies including engaging in major power diplomacy with Chinese characteristics, creating the human community with common destiny, promoting the construction of new international relationship rooted in the principle of cooperation and win-win, enriching the strategic thinking of peaceful development, sticking to the correct benefit view, formulating the partnership network the world over, advancing the global economic governance in a way of mutual consultation, joint construction and co-sharing, advocating the joint, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security concept, and launching the grand “Belt and Road” initiative. The Chinese solution composed of these contents, not only fundamentally different from the old roads of industrial revolution and colonial expansion in history, but also different from the market-driven neo-liberalism model currently advocated by Western countries and international organizations, stands at the height of the world and even mankind, seeking for global common development and having widened the road for the developing countries to modernization, which is widely welcomed by the international community. B. To Supplement and Perfect the Global Governance System. Currently, the international political practice in global governance is mostly problem-driven without creating a set of relatively independent, centralized and integral power structures, resulting in the existing global governance systemcharacterized as both extensive and unbalanced. China has been engaged in reform and innovation, while maintaining and constructing the existing systems, producing some thinking and method with Chinese characteristics. First, China sees the UN as a mirror that reflects the status quo of global governance, which should act as the leader of global governance, and actively safeguards the global governance system with the UN at the core. Second, China is actively promoting the transforming process of such recently emerged international mechanisms as G20, BRICS and SCO, perfecting them through practice, and boosting Asia-Pacific regional cooperation and the development of economic globalization. China is also promoting the construction of regional security mechanism through the Six-Party Talks on Korean Peninsula nuclear issue, Boao Forum for Asia, CICA and multilateral security dialog mechanisms led by ASEAN so as to lay the foundation for the future regional security framework. Third, China has initiated the establishment of AIIB and the New Development Bank of BRICS, creating a precedent for developing countries to set up multilateral financial institutions. The core of the new relationship between China and them lies in “boosting rather than controlling” and “public rather than private”, which is much different from the management and operation model of the World Bank, manifesting the increasing global governance ability of China and the developing countries as well as exerting pressure on the international economic and financial institution to speed up reforms. **Thus, in leading the transformation of the global governance system, China has not overthrown the existing systems and started all over again, but been engaged in innovating and perfecting; China has proactively undertaken international responsibilities, but has to do everything in its power and act according to its ability.** C. To Reform the Global Governance Rules. Many of the problems facing global governance today are deeply rooted in such a cause that the dominant power of the existing governance system has taken it as the tool to realize its own national interests first and a platform to pursue its political goals. Since the beginning of this year, the US has for several times requested the World Bank, IMF and G20 to make efforts to mitigate the so-called global imbalance, abandoned its commitment to support trade openness, cut down investment projects to the middle-income countries, and deleted commitment to support the efforts to deal with climate change financially, which has made the international systems accessories of the US domestic economic agendas, dealing a heavy blow to the global governance system. On the contrary, the interests and agendas of China, as a major power of the world, are open to the whole world, and China in the future “will provide the world with broader market, more sufficient capital, more abundant goods and more precious opportunities for cooperation”, while having the ability to make the world listen to its voice more attentively. With regard to the subject of global governance, China has advocated that what global governance system is better cannot be decided upon by any single country, as the destiny of the world should be in the hands of the people of all countries. In principle, all the parties should stick to the principle of mutual consultation, joint construction and co-sharing, resolve disputes through dialog and differences through consultation. Regarding the critical areas, opening to the outer world does not mean building one’s own backyard, but building the spring garden for co-sharing; the “Belt and Road” initiative is not China’s solo, but a chorus participated in by all countries concerned. **China has also proposed international public security views on nuclear security, maritime cooperation and cyber space order, calling for efforts to make the global village into a “grand stage for seeking common development” rather than a “wrestling arena”; we cannot “set up a stage here, while pulling away a prop there”, but “complement each other to put on a grand show”**. From the orientation of reforms, efforts should be made to better safeguard and expand the legitimate interests of the developing countries and increase the influence of the emerging economies on global governance. Over the past 5 years, China has attached importance to full court diplomacy, gradually coming to the center stage of international politics and proactively establishing principles for global governance. By hosting such important events as IAELM, CICA Summit, G20 Summit, the Belt and Road International Cooperation Forum and BRICS Summit, China has used theseplatforms to elaborate the Asia-Pacific Dream for the first time to the world, expressing China’s views on Asian security and global economic governance, discussing with the countries concerned with the Belt and Road about the synergy of their future development strategies and setting off the “BRICS plus” capacity expansion mechanism, in which China not only contributes its solution and shows its style, but also participates in the shaping of international principles through practice. On promoting the resolution of hot international issues, China abides by the norms governing international relations based on the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, and insists on justice, playing a constructive role as a responsible major power in actively promoting the political accommodation in Afghanistan, mediating the Djibouti-Eritrea dispute, promoting peace talks in the Middle East, devoting itself to the peaceful resolution of the South China Sea dispute through negotiations. In addition, China’s responsibility and quick response to international crises have gained widespread praises, as seen in such cases as assisting Africa in its fight against the Ebola epidemic, sending emergency fresh water to the capital of Maldives and buying rice from Cambodia to help relieve its financial squeeze, which has shown the simple feelings of the Chinese people to share the same breath and fate with the people of other countries. D. To Support the Increase of the Developing Countries’ Voice. The developing countries, especially the emerging powers, are not only the important participants of the globalization process, but also the important direction to which the international power system is transferring. With the accelerating shift of global economic center to emerging markets and developing economies, the will and ability of the developing countries to participate in global governance have been correspondingly strengthened. As the biggest developing country and fast growing major power, China has the same appeal and proposal for governance as other developing countries and already began policy coordination with them, as China should comply with historical tide and continue to support the increase of the developing countries’ voice in the global governance system. To this end, China has pursued the policy of “dialog but not confrontation, partnership but not alliance”, attaching importance to the construction of new type of major power relationship and global partnership network, while making a series proposals in the practice of global governance that could represent the legitimate interests of the developing countries and be conducive to safeguarding global justice, including supporting an open, inclusive, universal, balanced and win-win economic globalization; promoting the reforms on share and voting mechanism of IMF to increase the voting rights and representation of the emerging market economies; financing the infrastructure construction and industrial upgrading of other developing countries through various bilateral or regional funds; and helping other developing countries to respond to such challenges as famine, refugees, climate change and public hygiene by debt forgiveness and assistance.

#### Extinction

Robert Bailey 18, Vision of Earth contributor and computer science masters, 9-5-2018, "Why do we need global governance?," Vision of Earth, https://www.visionofearth.org/social-change/global-governance/

Global governance is necessary because humanity increasingly faces both problems and opportunities that are global in scale. Today, transnational problems such as violence and pandemics routinely reach across borders, affecting us all. At the same time, the increasingly integrated global system has also laid the necessary foundations for peace and spectacular prosperity. Effective global governance will allow us to end armed conflict, deal with new and emerging problems such as technological risks and automation, and to achieve levels of prosperity and progress never before seen.1 **The most important challenge for humanity to overcome is that of existential risks**. One way to look at the danger of an existential risk is to quantify the level of global coordination needed to deal with it. While best-shot risks, at one end of the spectrum only require that a single nation, organization or even individual (i.e., superhero) has the means and the will to save everyone, weakest-link risks, at the other end of the spectrum, are dangers that might require literally every country to take appropriate action to prevent catastrophe, with no room for failure.2 3 We’ve always been at risk of natural disaster, but with advances in our level of technology the risk we pose to ourselves as a species becomes ever greater. Nuclear weapons are a well-known risk that we still live with to this day. **The progress of technological research exposes us to new dangers such as bioengineered superbugs, nanotechnological menaces, and the risk of an out-of-control artificial intelligence with ill-intent**. Increased levels of global coordination are needed to combat many of these risks, as described in our article on the cooperation possibilities frontier. There are other problems that don’t necessarily threaten the species or even civilization as we know it, but which are holding back the development of prosperity and progress. Armed conflict, around since the dawn of history, still haunts us today. Even though wars between great powers appear to be a thing of the past, regional conflicts still account for tremendous human suffering and loss of life in parts of the world without stable governance.4 Other problems have emerged precisely because of our successes in the past. The unprecedented advancement of human wellbeing and prosperity over the past century has been based in large part on the use of fossil fuels, thus exposing us to climate change. Widespread automation, already a stressor on society, will put increased pressure on the social and economic fabric of our societies over the next few decades. Global governance can help alleviate these issues in various ways – we refer the interested reader to the very detailed work in Ruling Ourselves. Finally, global governance will increasingly be judged not only by the extent to which it prevents harm, but also by its demonstrated ability to improve human wellbeing.5 Progress has let us set our sights higher as a species, both for what we consider to be the right trajectory for humanity and for our own conduct.6 Major advances in human wellbeing can be accomplished with existing technology and modest improvements in global coordination. Effective global governance is global governance that tackles these issues better than the regional governments of the world can independently. Global governance is key to solving global problems. **Without it, we may not be able to avoid weakest-link existential risks or regulate new and dangerous technologies.** With it, we may be able to prosper as we never have before. The next step is to determine how effective global governance can be achieved.

# Case

#### Cant solve – doesn’t ensure that other countries are able to create or large countries distribute the vaccines. Their global production card never says how they are going to give them out or how they solve colonialism

#### Waivers undermine safety which makes the pandemic worse.

Mark **McClellan 21,** MD, PhD, “Reducing Global COVID Vaccine Shortages: New Research and Recommendations for US Leadership,” 4-15-2021, https://healthpolicy.duke.edu/sites/default/files/2021-04/US%20Vaccine%20Access%20Leadership.pdf

To address global access to COVID-19 vaccines and therapies under emergent circumstances, India, South Africa, and other nations have moved to temporarily waive World Trade Organization (WTO) provisions under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual While genuine and well-intentioned proponents of this waiver believe it will remove a significant barrier to increasing production and access, major scale-up of safe and reliable vaccine manufacturing requires overcoming a range of other challenges. Without ensuring adequate supply of key ingredients (e.g., lipids, vials, bags for bioreactors, etc.), **new efforts would likely complicate the fulfillment of existing contracts for authorized vaccines**. High-quality vaccine manufacturing is complex, requiring extensive technical knowhow and high-quality regulatory oversight, and experienced manufacturers will not participate without a no-fault compensation scheme to protect vaccine users in case of a serious adverse event. The unintended result could be less effective pandemic control, either because of compromised effectiveness of such vaccines or compromised public confidence in vaccination, **leading to greater outbreaks and more variants.** Global vaccine supply must be scaled up rapidly, without compromising safety or quality. WTO Director General Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala has proposed a “third way” alternative to a TRIPS waiver or direct vaccine supply. While not yet fully developed, this could include use of voluntary licensing arrangements to increase manufacturing capacity. Such arrangements would involve public-private partnerships that assure the transfer and use of the manufacturing quality knowhow needed for timely production of safe and effective vaccines. Similar models are already being implemented in India, Thailand, and elsewhere, through public-private partnerships with support from private philanthropy and investment of private capital.

#### WTO can’t solve – nations won’t come collaborate and regulate

**Aaronson**, George Washington University, **2014**, Susan, June, “Can Trade Policy Set Information Free” http://www.gwu.edu/~iiep/assets/docs/papers/2014WP/AaronsonIIEPWP20149.pdf

In theory, the WTO should be an appropriate venue for such discussions. WTO members agreed not to place tariffs on data flows. However, the member states **have not found common ground** on how to reduce new trade barriers to information flows. In 2011, several nations nixed a US and EU proposal that members agree not to block Internet service providers or impede the free flow of information online. Moreover, the members of the WTO have **made little progress on adding new regulatory issues** such as privacy and cyber security that challenge Internet policymakers. However, many new online activities will require cooperative global regulation on issues that transcend market access -- the traditional turf of the WTO. These issues will require policymakers to think less about ensuring that their model of regulation is adopted globally but more about achieving interoperability among different governance approaches. **Alas, policymakers are not consistently collaborating to achieve interoperability** The US, the EU, and Canada use trade policies to govern the Internet at home and across borders. The three trade giants use bilateral and regional trade agreements to encourage e-commerce, reduce online barriers to trade, and to develop shared policies in a world where technology is rapidly changing and **where governments compete to disseminate their regulatory approaches**. Policymakers also use **export controls**, trade **bans** or targeted **sanctions** to protect Internet users in other countries or to prevent officials of other countries from using Internet related technologies in ways that undermine the rights of individuals abroad. Finally, policymakers may use trade agreements **to challenge other governments’ online rules and policies** as trade barriers.

#### WTO already did the AFF – Doha Declaration nullifies medical patents for developing countries struggling with pricing

**World Trade Organization 17** (World Trade Organization – you should know who this is, “WTO IP rules amended to ease poor countries’ access to affordable medicines”, <https://www.wto.org/english/news_e/news17_e/trip_23jan17_e.htm>, 23 January 2017, EmmieeM)

**An amendment to** the agreement on **intellectual property entered** into force today (23 January) **securing for developing countries a legal pathway to access affordable medicines under WTO rules**.

The amendment to the WTO Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement marks the first time since the organization opened its doors in 1995 that WTO accords have been amended.

The WTO Secretariat has received in recent days notifications from five members that they have ratified the protocol amending the WTO TRIPS Agreement. These notifications — from Burkina Faso, Nigeria, Liechtenstein, the United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam — brought to two-thirds the number of WTO members which have now ratified the amendment. The two-thirds threshold was needed to formally bring the amendment into the TRIPS Agreement.

Members took the decision to amend the TRIPS Agreement **specifically to adapt** the **rules** of the global trading system **to the public health needs of people in poor countries**. This action follows repeated calls from the multilateral system for acceptance of the amendment, most recently by the United Nations General Assembly High-Level Meeting on Ending AIDS in June 2016.

“This is an **extremely important amendment**. It **gives legal certainty that generic medicines can be exported at reasonable prices to satisfy the needs of countries with** no pharmaceutical production capacity, or those with **limited capacity**. By doing so, **it helps the most vulnerable** access the drugs that meet their needs, helping to deal with diseases such as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis or malaria, as well as other epidemics. I am delighted that WTO members have now followed through on their commitment and brought this important measure into force,” said WTO Director-General Roberto Azevêdo. In video statements available here, some of the key players share their thoughts on the TRIPS amendment.

Unanimously adopted by WTO members in 2005, the protocol amending the TRIPS Agreement **makes permanent a mechanism to ease poorer WTO members’ access to affordable generic medicines produced in other countries**. The amendment **empowers** importing **developing and least-developed countries facing public health problems and lacking** the **capacity to produce drugs** generically to seek such medicines from third country producers under "compulsory licensing" arrangements. Normally, most medicines produced under compulsory licences can only be provided to the domestic market in the country where they are produced. This amendment allows exporting countries to grant compulsory licences to generic suppliers exclusively for the purpose of manufacturing and exporting needed medicines to countries lacking production capacity.

“As important as trade policy is, health and well-being must take precedence,” said Amina Mohamed, Kenya’s Foreign Minister who chaired the WTO General Council at the time when the amendment was approved in December 2005. “WTO members recognise this and have proven how seriously they take health issues by ratifying and putting into force an amendment to WTO rules which will facilitate access to essential medicines in low income countries.”

The amendment provides **a secure and sustained legal basis for** both potential exporters and importers to adopt legislation and establish the means needed to allow **countries** with limited or no production capacity **to import affordable generics from countries where pharmaceuticals are patented**. More and more WTO members are taking practical steps to implement the system in their laws. The bulk of global medicine exports is covered by laws enabling exports under this system, opening up new options for potential beneficiaries to access a wider range of potential suppliers and enabling new, innovative procurement strategies.

#### China led world order solves climate change, populism and protectionism.

Urs Schoettli 18, consultant on Asian affairs and a former Far East correspondent of the Swiss newspaper Neue Zürcher Zeitung., 8-7-2018, "Opinion: As U.S. Turns Inward, China Can Help Lead Multipolar World," No Publication, https://www.caixinglobal.com/2018-08-07/opinion-as-us-turns-inward-china-can-help-lead-multipolar-world-101312629.html

The major contributions China can make to the emerging global order are to support and enhance the functioning of international institutions, be they global such as the United Nations institutions or be they regional like the European Union or ASEAN. After the experiences of the last three decades, it is obvious that the policies of sanctions and of nation-building are misguided and dangerous tools of international power politics. Beijing is right in opposing them. Positive incentives are much more effective in bringing about remedial change than collective punishments. Equally, regime change has proved to be extremely dangerous as it has again and again worked against the wishes and the interests of the people concerned. In general, they have come out worse, and large-scale suffering and violence has been caused unnecessarily. It is understandable that the rise of China and the growth of its economic and geopolitical power cause concern in its immediate neighborhood and beyond. Every power shift creates new uncertainties and major geopolitical changes tend to arouse fears of conflict. Bearing in mind the giant existential challenges mankind faces on many fronts, **we need more than ever a stable global order that encourages peace and cooperation.** When we are confronted with ecological disasters that **threaten the future of human civilization**, it is highly irresponsible to indulge in military conflicts and civil wars. Mankind needs to mobilize all its forces and creative energies to fight the effects of **climate change**, **to combat dangerous populism**, and to overcome retrograde mentalities such as **nationalism and protectionism.** If China, with its remarkable track record of socio-economic and technological modernization, can take the lead in stimulating global cooperation on these crucial issues, **the 21st century can turn into an epoch of lasting peace and prosperity.**

#### Patents are key to adequate regulation and testing of drugs -- AFF leads to rampant counterfeiting and unsafe medication, which threatens public health, kills most vulnerable patients, and causes narcotic/human trafficking to surge. Especially true now due to public desperation over COVID, rise in e-commerce, and expansion of substandard medicine manufacturers targeting critical life-saving drugs

**IPKey 21** (IP Key – Run by EUIPO and the European Commission to provide news coverage and scientific knowledge concerning intellectual property rights, “**Intellectual Property** and **Keep**ing **Medicines Safe**”, https://ipkey.eu/en/south-east-asia/news/intellectual-property-and-keeping-medicines-safe, 2 February 2021, EmmieeM)

If you are what you eat, and bad diets lead to bad health, imagine what unsafe medicines can do.

We ask today, why the provenance of vaccines has attracted so much attention when the origin of medicines we take, in some cases, every day and without even thinking, is not questioned at all? How do we know we can trust medicines readily available on the market from seemingly legitimate sources? Where does intellectual property (IP) come into all of this and why is **a proper IP application and registration process** important?

The global race to develop vaccines to fight the spread of COVID-19 has understandably captured the attention of the public worldwide. People of all generations and with little or no expertise in clinical trials have followed the process keenly, wishing and willing together that science can provide the answer to stopping the pandemic so what was called ‘normal’ life can return. This public interest has also rightly scrutinised the testing that is designed to make sure that these vaccines are safe and this same focus is thankfully putting medicines under the spotlight more broadly.

When we talk about medicines, they are universally understood to mean a drug or other preparation for the treatment or prevention of a disease or illness. In essence, they serve to keep us feeling healthy, or make us feel better. But what about when they achieve the exact opposite, **when they are** in fact **harmful, or even fatal**? The cause is usually **because of** fake and counterfeit medicines. This is because something they both have in common is the **lack of rigorous inspections** by public authorities that seek to guarantee the safety of medicines for widespread use.

What’s more, the proliferation of both kinds of these illegal medicines is worsened by a critical fact. Previously, they used to mainly be related to ‘lifestyle’ medicines, but now, even **innovative** or **critical life-saving medicines,** such as medicines that tackle cardiovascular diseases, are being increasingly created and are entering the market **without official IP application** and registration processes.

But if **they are** both **illegal** and both cause harm, what’s the difference between fake and counterfeit medicines? Fake medicines pass themselves off as real, authorised medicines but they may actually contain ingredients that are of low quality or in the wrong dosage. **Since they have not passed through** the **necessary evaluation of quality, safety and efficacy as required by authorisation procedures, they can be a major health threat.** Counterfeit medicines, in contrast, are those medicines that do not comply with intellectual and industrial property rights, such as registered trade marks or patent rights. But it is important to stress, **this is not just an IP issue**. In the vast majority of cases (**90%**) they **can** also **be harmful to a patient’s health**, according to a study recently released by the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) on ‘Trade in Counterfeit Pharmaceutical Products’. The World Health Organization (WHO) also shared in the 2017 report, ‘WHO Global Surveillance and Monitoring System for Substandard and Falsified Medical Products’, that the estimated number of **children who** may **die from pneumonia** each year after consuming **counterfeit medicines is between 72 000 and 169 000**.