#### China strikes first

**Kulacki 20** [(Gregory Kulacki - journalist for the Diplomat, New York Times, NPR) “Would China Use Nuclear Weapons First in a War with the United States” 4-27-2020]

Richard should know about those publications, particularly the training manual. A U.S. Department of Defense translation has been circulating within the U.S. nuclear weapons policy community for more than a decade. The commander’s comments to the committee indicate a familiarity with the most controversial section of the manual, which, in the eyes of some U.S. analysts, indicates there may be some circumstances where China would use nuclear weapons first in a war with the United States.

This U.S. misperception is understandable, especially given the [difficulties](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2011-09/chickens-talking-ducks-us-chinese-nuclear-dialogue) the Defense Department encountered translating the text into English. The language, carefully considered in the context of the entire book, articulates a strong reaffirmation of China’s no first use policy. But it also **reveals Chinese military planners are struggling with crisis management and** considering steps that could create ambiguity with disastrous consequences.

Lowering the Threshold

Towards the end of the 405-page text on the operations of China’s strategic rocket forces, in a chapter entitled, “Second Artillery Deterrence Operations,” the authors explain what **China’s nuclear forces** train to **do if “a strong military power possessing nuclear‐armed missiles and an** absolute **advantage in high‐tech conventional weapons** **is carrying out intense and continuous attacks against our major strategic targets** and we have no good military strategy to resist the enemy.” The military power they’re talking about is the United States.

The authors indicate **China’s nuclear missile forces train to take specific steps**, including **increasing readiness and conducting launch exercises**, to “dissuade the continuation of the strong enemy’s conventional attacks.” The manual refers to **these steps** as an “**adjustment” to China’s nuclear policy** and a “lowering” of China’s threshold for brandishing its nuclear forces.

Chinese leaders would only take these steps in extreme circumstances. **The text highlights several triggers such as U.S. conventional bombing** of China’s nuclear and hydroelectric power plants, heavy conventional bombing of large cities like Beijing and Shanghai, **or other acts of conventional warfare** that “seriously threatened” the “safety and survival” of the nation.

#### No impact to grey goo

Shere 16 [(Jeremy, a science writer who has written and produced for some of public radio's top nationally syndicated science programs, including Sound Medicine, Earth & Sky, and A Moment of Science. His work has appeared in Talking Points Memo, Reuters, Matter Network, The Jerusalem Report, Bloom, and Reform Judaism, among others. He is the author of Renewable: The World-Changing Power of Alternative Energy. Shere teaches journalism and magazine writing at the School of Journalism at Indiana University in Bloomington, “Grey Goo Attack”, 4/2/2016]

Attack of the Killer Robots

Nanotechnology scientists dream of some day creating robots the size of molecules, or even turning molecules into machines that could roam the human body and perform all sorts of useful tasks. But some nanotechnology theorists and science fiction aficionados imagine a more ominous possibility. What if one of these tiny robots were given the ability to self-replicate? All it would take is a single malfunction and the robots would consume everything in the galaxy as they multiply out of control until all that was left was a shapeless, robotic mass called “grey goo.”

Worst Case Scenario

Now, before you go heading for the hills with a year’s supply of water and a survival guide, understand that the death-by-robot scenario is just that—a scenario, and a pretty fanciful one to boot. First, we’re nowhere near the point of being able to create a self-replicating nano-machine. But even if such machines do one day exist, they would have a hard time taking over the universe for one simple reason: fuel. Even microscopic machines need an energy source. Inorganic matter such as rocks and minerals wouldn’t do the trick because they just don’t contain stuff that the machines could break down and use for power. But what if a mad scientist created a robot that fed on organic materials such as sunlight and living things? Not to worry. Natural life forms have had around four billion years of training to compete for resources; the killer robots probably wouldn’t stand much of a chance against such streamlined competitors. Plus, if the robots were made from organic materials, they might be preyed on by bacteria or other predators.

## 1NC – CP

#### CP: Member nations of the World Trade Organization should eliminate patent protections for medicines except for extended-release formulations for epilepsy medicines.

Holman 18 [(Christopher M., Professor at the University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law, where his primary research focus lies at the intersection of intellectual property and biotechnology) “Why Follow-On Pharmaceutical Innovations Should Be Eligible For Patent Protection,” Intellectual Property Watch, 9/12/2018] JL

Follow-on pharmaceutical innovation can come in the form of an extended-release formulation that permits the drug to be administered at less frequent intervals than the original formulation. Critics of secondary patents downplay the significance of extended-release formulations, claiming that they represent nothing more than a ploy to extend patent protection without providing any real benefit to patients. In fact, the availability of a drug that can be taken once a day has been shown to improve patient compliance, a significant issue with many drugs, particularly in the case of drugs taken by patients with dementia or other cognitive impairments. Extended-release formulations can also provide a more consistent dosing throughout the day, avoiding the peaks and valleys in blood levels experienced by patients forced to take an immediate-release drug multiple times a day.

Other examples of improved formulations that provide real benefits to patients are orally administrable formulations of drugs that could previously only be administered by more invasive intravenous or intramuscular injection, combination products that combine two or more active pharmaceutical agents in a single formulation (resulting in improved patient compliance), and a heat-stable formulation of a lifesaving drug used to treat HIV infection and AIDS (an important characteristic for use in developing countries with a hot climate).

#### Extended-release epilepsy medicines save lives

Wheless and Phelps 18 [(James W., professor of neurology and pediatrics and director of the Texas Comprehensive Epilepsy Program and of the Epilepsy/EEG Fellowship Program at the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston and Stephanie J., Professor of Clinical Pharmacy and Pediatrics at The University of Tennessee Health Science Center) “A Clinician's Guide to Oral Extended-Release Drug Delivery Systems in Epilepsy,” Journal of Pediatric Pharmacology and Therapeutics, 8/2018] JL

There are many inherent advantages to using ER formulations. They may enhance adherence to AED therapy, minimize fluctuations in SDC, improve seizure control, and reduce toxicities associated with peak concentrations compared with IR formulations.

Enhanced Medication Adherence and Improved Quality of Life. Non-adherence to AEDs is a problem in the management of epilepsy, and it can have serious or even fatal consequences if patients experience inadequate seizure control (Table 2).17–19 In a US survey of 661 patients with epilepsy, 71% noted dose omissions and 45% reported a seizure following a missed dose.19 A large retrospective database analysis in a US managed-care adult population showed that during a mean follow-up of 27 months, 39% of patients with epilepsy were non-adherent.18 In another retrospective open-cohort study of claims data for 33,658 US Medic-aid patients with epilepsy, non-adherence to AEDs was associated with a more than 3-fold increase in mortality compared with adherence, and during periods of non-adherence patients had significantly higher incidences of emergency department visits, hospital admissions, motor vehicle injuries, and fractures.20

Evidence shows that patients receiving an ER formulation are more likely to continue with therapy than patients receiving IR formulations, and that there are no significant differences in AEs between the 3 formulations (Tegretol [ER carbamazepine], Carbatrol [ER carbamazepine], and a generic IR carbamazepine).21 In a review of studies that compared ER, conventional, and IR formulations of AEDs, several studies noted increases in adherence following a change from an IR to an ER formulation.17 In general, ER formulations were associated with reduced AEs, greater tolerability, improved dosing convenience, increased efficacy, and improvements in quality of life.17 Finally, because the likelihood of missing a dose increases with dosing frequency, and with the number of tablets/capsules taken,19 the simplification of dosing regimens with ER formulations is an important approach to improving adherence.13,15,17,22

Decreased Fluctuation in Peak-and-Trough SDC**.** Many AEDs have short half-lives. For IR formulations, this necessitates frequent dosing to maintain SDCs within the targeted range for optimal seizure control. The resulting wide peak-to-trough fluctuations in concentrations (Figure 1B) may increase the likelihood of both seizures and AEs.13,15,22,23

Extended-release formulations enable the dosing interval to be increased, which maintains concentration within the targeted range while decreasing fluctuations in peak-to-trough concentrations (Figure 1B). The decreased fluctuations may result in reduced toxicity and fewer concentration-related AEs compared with IR formulations.14,15,24 This may make ER formulations more forgiving to occasional irregular dosing compared with IR formulations. A pharmacokinetic simulation of Trokendi XR (topiramate; Supernus Pharmaceuticals, Rockville, MD) showed that following a delayed or omitted dose, SDC could be restored by giving the ER dose at any point within the next dosing interval, or by giving an additional ER dose together with the next scheduled dose.25

Less Frequent Local and Systemic AEs. Extended-release DDSs typically have slower release rates, which can result in fewer concentration-related AEs and can prevent side effects that may occur during the absorption phase with IR formulations.26 Lower peak concentrations may allow some patients to have their total daily dose increased without experiencing AEs, resulting in improved seizure control for the same chemical moiety when an ER formulation is used.

Uthman17 reviewed more than 15 studies comparing ER formulations of AEDs to IR, DR, or placebo products. A total of 4 of the 7 studies that directly compared ER and IR formulations showed significantly fewer AEs, better tolerability, and enhanced compliance for ER formulations of carbamazepine,27,28 levetiracetam,29 and valproate.30

Similarly to DR formulations, ER products have the potential to improve adherence by reducing local AEs, such as the gastrointestinal intolerance that can be associated with IR formulations. Additionally, ER formulations that are enteric coated may improve gastrointestinal tolerability in some patients. For example, the gastrointestinal AEs associated with valproic acid have been reduced by the introduction of enteric-coated formulations.31

Overall Decrease in Health Care Costs. The use of AED ER formulations is generally associated with better adherence and seizure control than IR formulations.17 Several studies in adults have shown that an increase in adherence was associated with a decrease in the costs of care and hospitalization (Table 2)18,32,33; hence, ER formulations have the potential to reduce overall health care costs compared with IR formulations. Helmers et al34 studied the economic burden associated with generic versus branded AEDs in the United States. They found that the periods of generic use were associated with higher total medical service cost (i.e., $3186) when compared to period of brand product use. Likewise, Labiner et al35 reported that generic AED use was associated with significantly greater use of medical services and increased risk of epilepsy-related medical events compared with brand use. Within an institutional setting, ER products require less pharmacy preparation and less nursing time related to administration (e.g., QD versus TID).

## 1NC – T

#### Interpretation – topical affs must defend a reduction of intellectual property protections for *medicines*.

#### Medicines are drugs

Senate Journal 12 [(SENATE JOURNAL STATE OF ILLINOIS )”NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY 92ND LEGISLATIVE DAY”, <https://www.ilga.gov/senate/journals/97/2012/SJ097092R.pdf>, MARCH 8, 2012]

Medicines means and includes all drugs intended for human or veterinary use approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration.

#### Violation – vaccines are not drugs

He et al 12 [(Yongqun, Professor of Microbiology and Immunology at the University of Michigan Medical School, primary bioinformatics interests are development of biomedical ontologies and their applications in literature mining, Bayesian network modeling, microbial genomics, and vaccine informatics)“A 2012 Workshop: Vaccine and Drug Ontology in the Study of Mechanism and Effect,” Journal of Biomedical Semantics, 12/18/2012] JL

Innovative therapeutic interventions are critical to prevent and treat human and animal diseases. A way to broadly classify therapeutic interventions is through their timing in administration: Vaccines are classically administered to prevent the appearance of a medical problem, while drugs are generally administered to treat a medical problem. Noticeable exceptions can be found for both classes of therapeutic interventions such as cancer vaccines (that are administered after detection of the problem), and protein pump inhibitors (that are often administered to prevent gastric problems in co-therapy with other drugs or in specific hospital settings). Nevertheless, vaccines and drugs are similarly regulated both in research and development, manufacturing, clinical trials, government approval and regulation, and post-licensing usage surveillance and monitoring. In a broader scope, vaccine is a special type of drug. Vaccines and drugs also have many differences. For example, for vaccines, dose, time, route, and frequency of administration are generally known quite precisely. However, since drugs are used for patients with different conditions, dose, time, and frequency of drug administration are often very difficult to establish. Since vaccines are often administered to healthy people to prevent medical problems, attribution of an adverse event following vaccination is less likely to be confounded by signs or symptoms of underlying medical problems as it is with drugs that are administered to treat medical problems. However, separation of manifestation of medical problem from manifestation of drug adverse event is often very challenging. In the U.S.A, vaccines are regulated under different laws by the Center for Biologics (CBER) at FDA, while drugs are regulated under the Food Drug and Cosmetic Act by the Center for Drugs (CDER) at FDA. Safety surveillance for vaccines is for the most part carried out by the Center for Disease Control (CDC) in Atlanta, while for drugs it is carried out by the FDA. Due to these similarities and differences between vaccines and drugs, a closer communication between these two areas is important to create effective ontological frameworks around which we can build comparative and predictive systems for both vaccines and drugs.

#### Vaccines are medical interventions not medicines

Elbe 10 (Stefan Elbe, [director of the Centre for Global Health Policy and a professor of international relations at the University of Sussex. He is the author of Strategic Implications of HIV/AIDS, Security and Global Health, and Virus Alert: Security, Governmentality, and the AIDS Pandemic.], 5-3-2010, “Security and Global Health” Polity Press, accessed: 8-9-2021, https://books.google.com/books?id=PKMoMJrSsksC) ajs

Yet here too we must be careful not to overlook other types of medical intervention simultaneously pursued by the 'social' arm of modern medicine at the population level. Vaccines in particular continue to be particularly important medical interventions that repeatedly surface in a variety of different health security delib- erations. Strictly speaking, vaccines are not medicines because they consist of small concentrations of disease-causing microbes (or their derivatives) used to enhance a person's immuno-response to a future infection. As a public health measure, vaccines have therefore also been largely sidelined in the existing medicalization literature. Yet, generally speaking, vaccines too can be considered as medical inter- ventions. That is certainly how the World Health Organization views them, pointing out that 'vaccines are among the most important medical interventions for reducing illness and deaths' available today (WHO 2009a). Whereas pills and other therapies mark the tools of clinical medicine, vaccines play a crucial part in the arsenal of 'social' medicine and public health. Developing and rolling out of new vaccines against a range of current (and future) diseases therefore represents further evidence of how the rise of health security is also encouraging security to be practised through the introduction of new medical interventions in society.

#### Prefer –

#### Limits – allowing non medicines explodes limits to include affs that defend reducing protections for surgeries, therapy, injury prevention, cosmetic procedures, etc. - makes neg prep impossible because the case neg to the Botox and Laser Eye Surgery affs would have no overlap -- privileges the aff by stretching pre-tournament neg prep too thin and precluding nuanced rigorous testing of aff.

#### Ground – arbitrarily not defending medicines kills links to core neg generics about drug innovation, competition over pharmaceutical development, or production of medicine needing to increase because medical interventions are uncontroversial. Drugs and Vaccines are not regulated in the same way which proves any lit about why WTO changing protections for one would not be applicable to the other – that’s He. Pushes 1NCs to the fringes like Ks that disagree with everything or sketchy CPs which destroys clash.

#### Paradigm issues –

#### Drop the debater – their abusive advocacy skewed the debate from the start

#### Comes before 1AR theory – NC abuse is responsive to them not being topical

#### Fairness is a voter ­– necessary to determine the better debater

#### Education is a voter – why schools fund debate

## 1NC – DA

#### WTO is near consensus on fisheries subsidies – success will require continued focus, flexibility, and cooperation among members

WTO 7/15 [(World Trade Organization) “WTO members edge closer to fisheries subsidies agreement,” News and Events, 7/15/2021] JL

During an all-day meeting with 104 ministers and heads of delegation, WTO members pledged to conclude the negotiations soon and certainly before the WTO's Ministerial Conference in early December, and to empower their Geneva-based delegations to do so. Members also confirmed that the negotiating text currently before them can be used as the basis for the talks to strike the final deal.

“I feel new hope this evening. Because ministers and heads of delegation today demonstrated a strong commitment to moving forward and doing the hard work needed to get these negotiations to the finish line. I applaud you for this. In 20 years of negotiations, this is the closest we have ever come towards reaching an outcome — a high-quality outcome that would contribute to building a sustainable blue economy,” said Director-General Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala.

“One fundamental conclusion that I draw from your interventions today is that members are ready to use the text as the basis for future negotiations. A second takeaway from today was that there is universal agreement about the importance of the food and livelihood security of artisanal fishers in developing and least developed countries. The prospect for a deal in the autumn ahead of our Ministerial Conference has clearly improved.”

The UN Food and Agriculture Organization estimates that one-third of global fish stocks are overfished and most of the rest is fully exploited. This is up from 10% in 1970 and 27% in 2000. Depleted stocks threaten the food security of low-income coastal communities, and the livelihoods of poor and vulnerable fishers who must go further and further from shore only to bring back smaller and smaller hauls.

Each year, governments hand out around $35 billion in fisheries subsidies, two-thirds of which go to commercial fishers. These subsidies keep at sea vessels which would otherwise be economically unviable. World leaders in 2015 made a fisheries subsidies agreement by 2020 part of the Sustainable Development Goals and trade ministers reaffirmed this pledge in 2017.

The negotiations on fisheries subsidies disciplines have been ongoing for nearly 20 years. Although there has been recent progress thanks to the intensive work that led to the development of the negotiating text on which members are working, the lack of political impetus in the talks to close the remaining gaps inspired Director-General Okonjo-Iweala to call this meeting of ministers.

Among the thorniest issues to resolve has been how to extend special and differential treatment to developing and least developed country WTO members while preserving the overall objective of enhanced sustainability of the oceans. Ministers said that the livelihoods and food security of poor and vulnerable artisanal fishers in developing and least developed countries were of great importance, as was preserving the sustainability objective of the negotiations.

Amb. Santiago Wills of Colombia, who chairs the Rules Negotiating Group overseeing the fisheries subsidies negotiations, said he had received some valuable inputs from the discussions. He now has greater clarity on the path forward and the next steps that would be required to harvest an agreement. He will be consulting with the Director-General and WTO members about charting the path forward for the next stage of the talks.

“I am very heartened by the responses and messages that we have heard today. What we sought from ministers today was political guidance to help close these negotiations soon. And we did hear that guidance. We have been given the ingredients to reach a successful conclusion; a commitment to finish well ahead of our Ministerial Conference a text that can be the platform for this final stage of the negotiations and fully empowered heads of delegations in Geneva. This represents a real success,” said Amb. Wills.

The Director-General said that delegations needed to prepare for an intensive period of line by line negotiations.

“As we enter this new phase of text-based discussions, the responsibility to conclude these negotiations is truly in the hands of members. To get from here to an agreement, it will be your job to find the necessary trade-offs and flexibilities. A successful outcome by MC12 is ultimately your responsibility,” she said. “The world is watching. The fisheries subsidies negotiations are a test both of the WTO's credibility as a multilateral negotiating forum and of the trading system's ability to respond to problems of the global commons.  If we wait another 20 years, there may be no marine fisheries left to subsidise — or artisanal fishing communities to support.”

#### IP disputes fragment WTO unity and trade off with subsidies negotiation

Patnaik 3/12 [(Priti, journalist in Geneva, Switzerland, master’s in Development Studies from The Graduate Institute in Geneva and a master’s in Business and Economic Reporting from New York University) “Could Vaccine Nationalism Spur Disputes At The WTO?” Geneva Health Files, 3/12/2021] JL

It is not just trade restrictive measures that could result in trade disputes. The heated political discussions on the TRIPS waiver at WTO is also aggravating the potential for disputes, according to experts involved in litigations in international trade in Geneva. Therefore these ostensibly independent processes, can catalyse disputes.

“The waiver discussion is very heated and it is aggravating the discussion on the EU's export restrictions. If the waiver succeeds, then the opposing members cannot do anything about it. So they will be looking at other ways to beat up on behavior they do not like on the COVID-19 front,” one trade law expert said.  Do not rule out disputes against supporters of the TRIPS waiver proposal, in case the waiver is adopted, the source added.

In their statement at the WTO General Council meeting last week, the EU said, “In order to ensure that vaccines and their ingredients are not directed to export destinations in unjustified volumes, the European Union had no choice but to introduce a transparency mechanism on Covid-19 vaccine export transactions.” The EU has said that the measures are WTO-consistent.

It added “Since the entry into force of the scheme on the 1 February, we have received 150 requests for export authorisation. All of them have been accepted. I repeat, all of them.” This week, the European Commission extended transparency and authorisation mechanism for exports of COVID-19 vaccines.

The EU is also a part of the Ottawa Group proposal on Trade and Health that also spells out commitments towards export restrictions. (See also *E.U. Exports Millions of Covid Vaccine Doses Despite Supply Crunch at Home*)

“Members bring disputes all the time, even when they know that it's going to take a long time to get a result and often they bring a dispute as leverage for negotiations. Filing a dispute does not mean they are looking for a solution. It does not mean the dispute will be litigated all the way to the end,” a trade lawyer said.

It could also result in a negotiated arrangement, like it was in 2001 in the U.S.-Brazil case. “Why did the U.S. bring a case against Brazil? It gave them leverage in negotiations, and to satisfy domestic stakeholders,” the lawyer added.

The impasse at the Appellate Body may not be a deterrent for countries to dissuade countries from bringing a dispute, some believe.

“The Appellate Body not being functional is not a problem. Countries have recourse to Article 25 under the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) that provides for ‘expeditious arbitration as a alternate means to dispute settlement’,” a source involved in the WTO litigation process said. (The EU, for example, is a signatory to the Multi-party interim appeal arbitration arrangement, MPIA.)

While disputes may take up precious energy and resources of members already stretched in fighting to address the pandemic, it may likely be a strategy to address trade protectionism. Not all agree.

“I think the law is not really an answer here, I hate to say that because I'm a lawyer. But I really don't think the law is an answer because the law is so generically drafted right that and it's politically so sensitive. Which WTO panel will tell a member that restricting vaccines is not legitimate? It will ultimately harm the legitimacy of the trading system,” the person added.

#### Overfishing causes SCS war – WTO agreement solves

Cohen and Floyd 1/27 [(Sam, J.D. student at Harvard Law School, BA in history from Yale University, surface warfare officer in the U.S. Navy, and Steve, joint J.D./LL.M. in national security law at Georgetown University Law Center, lieutenant commander in U.S. Naval Intelligence) “Water Wars Special: How IUU Fishing Increases the Risk of Conflict, Lawfare, 1/27/2021] JL

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations has classified one-third of the world’s marine fisheries as overfished. The impact of unsustainable fishing is especially acute in the South China Sea, where coastal fisheries have lost 70 to 95 percent of their stocks since the mid-20th century and catch rates have declined by 70 percent throughout the past two decades. Furthermore, the sea’s coral reefs, which nurture critical feeding grounds for fish stocks, decline by 16 percent every 10 years. As traditional fishing grounds prove less fruitful, fishermen venture farther from shore and operate in contested areas. Indeed, when China faced dwindling coastal stocks in the 1990s, Beijing embarked on a massive shipbuilding effort; and President Xi Jinping continues to exhort Chinese fishermen to “build bigger ships and venture even farther into the oceans and catch bigger fish.” Such efforts incentivize IUU activity, heighten competition for increasingly scarce resources and feed an escalating cycle that accelerates stock depletion.

In the South China Sea, with its kaleidoscope of disputed claims, China’s excess capacity and IUU fishing practices exacerbate a particularly volatile environment. Depleted fishing stocks force fishermen to operate further from shore and increase the chance of violent encounters. Filipino authorities have intercepted Chinese boats illegally fishing off Palawan, and Philippine President Rodrigo Duterte claimed that Chinese fishermen intentionally rammed a Filipino fishing boat and left its crew stranded in the sea in 2019. Three years earlier, the Chinese Coast Guard rammed an Indonesian patrol boat attempting to interdict Chinese fishermen. As the Vietnamese government actively encourages fishermen to contest China’s expansive maritime claims, the Chinese Coast Guard expelled nearly 1,200 fishing boats from the northern half of the South China Sea last summer. During one such encounter, a Chinese Coast Guard vessel repeatedly rammed a Vietnamese fishing boat and sent its 17-person crew overboard. It’s true that fishing subsidies did not create the region’s historic animosities. But the activities these subsidies support add fuel to an already smoldering fire.

Dwindling stocks of fish, unsustainable practices and IUU fishing constitute a global crisis and increase the risk of maritime conflict. But this risk can be mitigated through international cooperation: A World Trade Organization (WTO) agreement on fishing subsidies would address a fundamental cause of these fishing-related problems and create a binding legal framework through which members could seek relief.

#### SCS conflict draws in the US and goes nuclear – extinction

Carter 20 (John Carter has been an economics and finance journalist for more than 40 years. Prior to joining the South China Morning Post, he worked for Market News International for more than 33 years, first as Washington Bureau Chief, then as European Managing Editor in Frankfurt, Germany and finally as Asian Managing Editor working out of Beijing, Global Impact newsletter: escalating conflict in the South China Sea, https://www.scmp.com/economy/article/3102323/global-impact-newsletter-escalating-conflict-south-china-sea)

If you want to start a world war, a good way to do it is to mix the escalating conflict between two of the world’s greatest military powers with the grievances of a half-dozen smaller countries over territorial claims. That’s the current situation in the South China Sea, the massive body of water that stretches more than 4,000km (2,485 miles) from mainland China in the north to Indonesia in the south – about the same distance between London and Chicago. China has claimed the vast majority of the South China Sea as its exclusive territory, including areas claimed by six other governments – Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Taiwan, and Vietnam – that consider them part of their own exclusive economic zones. A map of the conflicting claims can be seen in this graphic presentation, while the history of China’s territorial disputes, including in the South China Sea, is explained in this video. China considers the South China Sea one of its “core” interests, of equal importance as Taiwan, Tibet and Xinjiang, meaning it is ready to go to war to defend it. It has marked the territory by a “nine dash line” on its maps, and even on its passports, angering its neighbours. China needs the oil and mineral wealth hidden beneath the South China Sea to supply its rapid economic recovery, as well as the fishing catch needed to feed the country’s 1.4 billion stomachs. An international tribunal ruled in 2016 that China did not have the right to claim the South China Sea as its sovereign territory, a ruling that China has pointedly rejected. To secure this vast sea area, China has turned uninhabited atolls and half-submerged rock formations into forward military bases, as personally directed by President Xi Jinping. Regular Chinese sea patrols monitor the area, driving away fishing boats from other nations from what it considers its exclusive fishing area. The intrusion of China into what other Asian nations consider their sovereign territory has caused tensions in the region to ratchet up, with the 10 members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (Asean) increasingly pushing back, at times with violent confrontations. The US has flatly rejected Chinese claims to the South China Sea, and has dramatically stepped up its military presence in the area. Each side has warned the other of the dangers of further escalation, with the US sanctioning Chinese firms that helped build China’s island outposts. Rarely a week goes by without a US warship sailing near Chinese held outputs as part a “freedom of navigation” exercise, shadowed by Chinese vessels the entire way. Confrontations have brought warships from both nations within a few metres of each other, a dangerous situation that could easily get out of hand. Tensions have ratched up recently, with the Chinese and US navies holding exercises in the region at the same time. In a provocation move, the Chinese test fired several of its “aircraft carrier killer” missiles in a clear warning to the US to back off its “interference” in the South China Sea. And some Asean nations are starting to push back against Chinese “intrusions” into their territorial waters, threatening to draw the US deeper into local disputes, though the group as a whole is trying to avoid picking sides in the US-China confrontation. The latest incident occurred this week, with Indonesia’s foreign ministry lodging an official protest after a Chinese coastguard ship spent two days sailing through Indonesia territorial waters. Chinese military commands have been ordered not to shoot first in any confrontation with the US military, but with heavily armed warships and planes constantly patrolling the area, even a small error in judgment could lead to a shooting war. And with the US presidential election less than two months away, there is no sign that tensions between two of the world’s largest militaries will de-escalate any time soon.

#### Nuclear war causes extinction – famine and climate change

Starr 15 [(Steven, Director of the University of Missouri’s Clinical Laboratory Science Program and a senior scientist at the Physicians for Social Responsibility) “Nuclear War, Nuclear Winter, and Human Extinction,” Federation of American Scientists, 10/14/2015] DD

While it is impossible to precisely predict all the human impacts that would result from a nuclear winter, it is relatively simple to predict those which would be most profound. That is, a nuclear winter would cause most humans and large animals to die from nuclear famine in a mass extinction event similar to the one that wiped out the dinosaurs.

Following the detonation (in conflict) of US and/or Russian launch-ready strategic nuclear weapons, nuclear firestorms would burn simultaneously over a total land surface area of many thousands or tens of thousands of square miles. These mass fires, many of which would rage over large cities and industrial areas, would release many tens of millions of tons of black carbon soot and smoke (up to 180 million tons, according to peer-reviewed studies), which would rise rapidly above cloud level and into the stratosphere. [For an explanation of the calculation of smoke emissions, see Atmospheric effects & societal consequences of regional scale nuclear conflicts.]

The scientists who completed the most recent peer-reviewed studies on nuclear winter discovered that the sunlight would heat the smoke, producing a self-lofting effect that would not only aid the rise of the smoke into the stratosphere (above cloud level, where it could not be rained out), but act to keep the smoke in the stratosphere for 10 years or more. The longevity of the smoke layer would act to greatly increase the severity of its effects upon the biosphere.

Once in the stratosphere, the smoke (predicted to be produced by a range of strategic nuclear wars) would rapidly engulf the Earth and form a dense stratospheric smoke layer. The smoke from a war fought with strategic nuclear weapons would quickly prevent up to 70% of sunlight from reaching the surface of the Northern Hemisphere and 35% of sunlight from reaching the surface of the Southern Hemisphere. Such an enormous loss of warming sunlight would produce Ice Age weather conditions on Earth in a matter of weeks. For a period of 1-3 years following the war, temperatures would fall below freezing every day in the central agricultural zones of North America and Eurasia. [For an explanation of nuclear winter, see Nuclear winter revisited with a modern climate model and current nuclear arsenals: Still catastrophic consequences.]

Nuclear winter would cause average global surface temperatures to become colder than they were at the height of the last Ice Age. Such extreme cold would eliminate growing seasons for many years, probably for a decade or longer. Can you imagine a winter that lasts for ten years?

The results of such a scenario are obvious. Temperatures would be much too cold to grow food, and they would remain this way long enough to cause most humans and animals to starve to death.

Global nuclear famine would ensue in a setting in which the infrastructure of the combatant nations has been totally destroyed, resulting in massive amounts of chemical and radioactive toxins being released into the biosphere. We don’t need a sophisticated study to tell us that no food and Ice Age temperatures for a decade would kill most people and animals on the planet.  Would the few remaining survivors be able to survive in a radioactive, toxic environment?

## 1NC – CP

#### CP Text: the United States should

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

#### -distribute 8 billion doses of COVID vaccines using an equitable distribution framework prioritizing developing countries in the Global South.

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

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

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

**Our interpretation is that the negative may read 3 conditional advocacies.**

**Net benefits -**

1. **Neg flex – condo is key to allowing the neg to test the aff from multiple perspectives – that outweighs aff strategy – the aff gets infinite prep, but the neg is purely reactionary**
2. **Info processing – condo teaches us to think quickly and deal with overwhelming amounts of info – most real world. Simulating information overload best prepares students to cope—most valuable skill.**

## 1NC – CP

#### CP: Member nations of the World Trade Organization should enter into a prior and binding consultation with the World Health Organization over eliminating patent protections for medicines. Member nations will support the proposal and adopt the results of consultation.

#### WHO says yes

Kimball 5/7 [(Spencer, news editor with CNBC.com) “WHO chief urges world to follow U.S. lead and support waiving Covid vaccine patent protections,” CNBC, 5/7/2021] JL

World Health Organization Director General-Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus on Friday urged other countries, particularly the Group of Seven industrialized nations, to follow the U.S. example and support a World Trade Organization motion to temporarily waive Covid-19 vaccine patent protections.

“Wednesday’s announcement by the U.S. that it will support a temporary waiver of intellectual property protections for Covid-19 vaccines is a significant statement of solidarity and support for vaccine equity,” Tedros said at a press briefing. “I know that this is not a politically easy thing to do, so I very much appreciate the leadership of the U.S. and we urge other countries to follow their example.”

#### Consultation displays strong leadership, authority, and cohesion among member states which are key to WHO legitimacy

Gostin et al 15 [(Lawrence O., Linda D. & Timothy J. O’Neill Professor of Global Health Law at Georgetown University, Faculty Director of the O’Neill Institute for National & Global Health Law, Director of the World Health Organization Collaborating Center on Public Health Law & Human Rights, JD from Duke University) “The Normative Authority of the World Health Organization,” Georgetown University Law Center, 5/2/2015] JL

Members want the WHO to exert leadership, harmonize disparate activities, and set priorities. Yet they resist intrusions into their sovereignty, and want to exert control. In other words, ‘everyone desires coordination, but no one wants to be coordinated.’ States often ardently defend their geostrategic interests. As the Indonesian virus-sharing episode illustrates, the WHO is pulled between power blocs, with North America and Europe (the primary funders) on one side and emerging economies such as Brazil, China, and India on the other. An inherent tension exists between richer ‘net contributor’ states and poorer ‘net recipient’ states, with the former seeking smaller WHO budgets and the latter larger budgets.

Overall, national politics drive self-interest, with states resisting externally imposed obligations for funding and action. Some political leaders express antipathy to, even distrust of, UN institutions, viewing them as bureaucratic and inefficient. In this political environment, it is unsurprising that members fail to act as shareholders. Ebola placed into stark relief the failure of the international community to increase capacities as required by the IHR. Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone had some of the world's weakest health systems, with little capacity to either monitor or respond to the Ebola epidemic.20 This caused enormous suffering in West Africa and placed countries throughout the region e and the world e at risk. Member states should recognize that the health of their citizens depends on strengthening others' capacity. The WHO has a central role in creating systems to facilitate and encourage such cooperation.

The WHO cannot succeed unless members act as shareholders, foregoing a measure of sovereignty for the global common good. It is in all states' interests to have a strong global health leader, safeguarding health security, building health systems, and reducing health inequalities. But that will not happen unless members fund the Organization generously, grant it authority and flexibility, and hold it accountable.

#### WHO is critical to disease prevention – it is the only international institution that can disperse information, standardize global public health, and facilitate public-private cooperation

Murtugudde 20 [(Raghu, professor of atmospheric and oceanic science at the University of Maryland, PhD in mechanical engineering from Columbia University) “Why We Need the World Health Organization Now More Than Ever,” Science, 4/19/2020] JL

WHO continues to play an indispensable role during the current COVID-19 outbreak itself. In November 2018, the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine organised a workshop to explore lessons from past influenza outbreaks and so develop recommendations for pandemic preparedness for 2030. The salient findings serve well to underscore the critical role of WHO for humankind.

The world’s influenza burden has only increased in the last two decades, a period in which there have also been 30 new zoonotic diseases. A warming world with increasing humidity, lost habitats and industrial livestock/poultry farming has many opportunities for pathogens to move from animals and birds to humans. Increasing global connectivity simply catalyses this process, as much as it catalyses economic growth.

WHO coordinates health research, clinical trials, drug safety, vaccine development, surveillance, virus sharing, etc. The importance of WHO’s work on immunisation across the globe, especially with HIV, can hardly be overstated. It has a rich track record of collaborating with private-sector organisations to advance research and development of health solutions and improving their access in the global south.

It discharges its duties while maintaining a dynamic equilibrium between such diverse and powerful forces as national securities, economic interests, human rights and ethics. COVID-19 has highlighted how political calculations can hamper data-sharing and mitigation efforts within and across national borders, and WHO often simply becomes a convenient political scapegoat in such situations.

International Health Regulations, a 2005 agreement between 196 countries to work together for global health security, focuses on detection, assessment and reporting of public health events, and also includes non-pharmaceutical interventions such as travel and trade restrictions. WHO coordinates and helps build capacity to implement IHR.

#### Extinction – defense is wrong

Piers Millett 17, Consultant for the World Health Organization, PhD in International Relations and Affairs, University of Bradford, Andrew Snyder-Beattie, “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity”, Health Security, Vol 15(4), http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/hs.2017.0028

Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3 while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world’s population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization.

A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to remote populations, overcome rare genetic resistances, and evade detection, cures, and countermeasures. Even evolution itself may work in humanity’s favor: Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off, and so evolutionary pressures could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6

While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they do not rule the possibility out entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of species going extinct due to disease—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include native American tribes exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and theWestern Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population).

In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But many diseases are proof of principle that each worst-case attribute can be realized independently. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, natural evolution would be an unlikely source for pathogens with the highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach. But advances in biotechnology might allow the creation of diseases that combine such traits. Recent controversy has already emerged over a number of scientific experiments that resulted in viruses with enhanced transmissibility, lethality, and/or the ability to overcome therapeutics.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-2

#### WHO diplomacy solves great power conflict

Murphy 20 [(Chris, U.S. senator from Connecticut serving on the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee) “The Answer is to Empower, Not Attack, the World Health Organization,” War on the Rocks, 4/21/2020] JL

The World Health Organization is critical to stopping disease outbreaks and strengthening public health systems in developing countries, where COVID-19 is starting to appear. Yemen announced its first infection earlier this month, and other countries in Africa, Asia and the Middle East are at severe risk. Millions of refugees rely on the World Health Organization for their health care, and millions of children rely on the WHO and UNICEF to access vaccines.

The World Health Organization is not perfect, but its team of doctors and public health experts have had major successes. Their most impressive claim to fame is the eradication of smallpox – no small feat. More recently, the World Health Organization has led an effort to rid the world of two of the three strains of polio, and they are close to completing the trifecta.

These investments are not just the right thing to do; they benefit the United States. Improving health outcomes abroad provides greater political and economic stability, increasing demand for U.S. exports. And, as we are all learning now, it is in America’s national security interest for countries to effectively detect and respond to potential pandemics before they reach our shores.

As the United States looks to develop a new global system of pandemic prevention, there is absolutely no way to do that job without the World Health Organization. Uniquely, it puts traditional adversaries – like Russia and the United States, India and Pakistan, or Iran and Saudi Arabia – all around the same big table to take on global health challenges. It has relationships with the public health leaders of every nation, decades of experience in tackling viruses and diseases, and the ability to bring countries together to tackle big projects. This ability to bridge divides and work across borders cannot be torn down and recreated – not in today’s environment of major power competition – and so there is simply no way to build an effective international anti-pandemic infrastructure without the World Health Organization at the center.

#### Ought means should

Merriam Webster, No Date – Merriam Webster’s Learner’s Dictionary, “ought”, <http://www.learnersdictionary.com/definition/ought>  
ought /ˈɑːt/ verb  
Learner's definition of OUGHT [modal verb] 1 ◊ Ought is almost always followed by to and the infinitive form of a verb. The phrase ought to has the same meaning as should and is used in the same ways, but it is less common and somewhat more formal. The negative forms ought not and oughtn't are often used without a following to. — used to indicate what is expected They ought to be here by now. You ought to be able to read this book. There ought to be a gas station on the way. 2 — used to say or suggest what should be done You ought to get some rest. That leak ought to be fixed. You ought to do your homework.

#### Should is certain and immediate

Summers 94 (Justice – Oklahoma Supreme Court, “Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, 1994 OK 123, 11-8, http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13)

¶4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti.[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14) The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.[16](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn16) [CONTINUES – TO FOOTNOTE] [13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn13) "*Should*" not only is used as a "present indicative" synonymous with *ought* but also is the past tense of "shall" with various shades of meaning not always easy to analyze. See 57 C.J. Shall § 9, Judgments § 121 (1932). O. JESPERSEN, GROWTH AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1984); St. Louis & S.F.R. Co. v. Brown, 45 Okl. 143, 144 P. 1075, 1080-81 (1914). For a more detailed explanation, see the Partridge quotation infra note 15. Certain contexts mandate a construction of the term "should" as more than merely indicating preference or desirability. Brown, supra at 1080-81 (jury instructions stating that jurors "should" reduce the amount of damages in proportion to the amount of contributory negligence of the plaintiff was held to imply an *obligation* *and to be more than advisory*); Carrigan v. California Horse Racing Board, 60 Wash. App. 79, [802 P.2d 813](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=802&box2=P.2D&box3=813) (1990) (one of the Rules of Appellate Procedure requiring that a party "should devote a section of the brief to the request for the fee or expenses" was interpreted to mean that a party is under an *obligation* to include the requested segment); State v. Rack, 318 S.W.2d 211, 215 (Mo. 1958) ("should" would mean the same as "shall" or "must" when used in an instruction to the jury which tells the triers they "should disregard false testimony"). [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) In praesenti means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is presently or immediately effective, as opposed to something that will or would become effective in the future *[in futurol*]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

## 1NC – DA

#### Biotech industry strong now.

Cancherini et al. 4/30 [(Laura, Engagement Manager @ McKinsey & Company, Joseph Lydon, Associate Partner @ McKinsey & Company, Jorge Santos Da Silva, Senior Partner at McKinsey & Company, and Alexandra Zemp, Partner at McKinsey & Company), “What’s ahead for biotech: Another wave or low tide?“, McKinsey & Company, 4-30-2021, https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/whats-ahead-for-biotech-another-wave-or-low-tide] TDI

As the pandemic spread across the globe in early 2020, biotech leaders were initially pessimistic, reassessing their cash position and financing constraints. When McKinsey and BioCentury interviewed representatives from 106 biotech companies in May 2020,4 half of those interviewed were expecting delays in financing, and about 80 percent were tight on cash for the next two years and considering trade-offs such as deferring IPOs and acquisitions. Executives feared that valuations would decline because of lower revenue projections and concerns about clinical-trial delays, salesforce-effectiveness gaps, and other operational issues.

Belying this downbeat mood, biotech has in fact had one of its best years so far. By January 2021, venture capitalists had invested some 60 percent more than they had in January 2020, with more than $3 billion invested worldwide in January 2021 alone.5 IPO activity grew strongly: there were 19 more closures than in the same period in 2020, with an average of $150 million per raise, 17 percent more than in 2020. Other deals have also had a bumper start to 2021, with the average deal size reaching more than $500 million, up by more than 66 percent on the 2020 average (Exhibit 3).6

What about SPACs?

The analysis above does not include special-purpose acquisition companies (SPACs), which have recently become significant in IPOs in several industries. Some biotech investors we interviewed believe that SPACs represent a route to an IPO. How SPACs will evolve remains to be seen, but biotechs may be part of their story.

Fundamentals continue strong

When we asked executives and investors why the biotech sector had stayed so resilient during the worst economic crisis in decades, they cited innovation as the main reason. The number of assets transitioning to clinical phases is still rising, and further waves of innovation are on the horizon, driven by the convergence of biological and technological advances.

In the present day, many biotechs, along with the wider pharmaceutical industry, are taking steps to address the COVID-19 pandemic. Together, biotechs and pharma companies have more than 250 vaccine candidates in their pipelines, along with a similar number of therapeutics. What’s more, the crisis has shone a spotlight on pharma as the public seeks to understand the roadblocks involved in delivering a vaccine at speed and the measures needed to maintain safety and efficacy standards. To that extent, the world has been living through a time of mass education in science research and development.

Biotech has also benefited from its innate financial resilience. Healthcare as a whole is less dependent on economic cycles than most other industries. Biotech is an innovator, actively identifying and addressing patients’ unmet needs. In addition, biotechs’ top-line revenues have been less affected by lockdowns than is the case in most other industries.

Another factor acting in the sector’s favor is that larger pharmaceutical companies still rely on biotechs as a source of innovation. With the top dozen pharma companies having more than $170 billion in excess reserves that could be available for spending on M&A, the prospects for further financing and deal making look promising.

For these and other reasons, many investors regard biotech as a safe haven. One interviewee felt it had benefited from a halo effect during the pandemic.

More innovation on the horizon

The investors and executives we interviewed agreed that biotech innovation continues to increase in quality and quantity despite the macroeconomic environment. Evidence can be seen in the accelerating pace of assets transitioning across the development lifecycle. When we tracked the number of assets transitioning to Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III clinical trials, we found that Phase I and Phase II assets have transitioned 50 percent faster since 2018 than between 2013 and 2018, whereas Phase III assets have maintained much the same pace. There could be many reasons for this, but it is worth noting that biotechs with Phase I and Phase II assets as their lead assets have accounted for more than half of biotech IPOs. Having an early IPO gives a biotech earlier access to capital and leaves it with more scope to concentrate on science.

Looking forward, the combination of advances in biological science and accelerating developments in technology and artificial intelligence has the potential to take innovation to a new level. A recent report from the McKinsey Global Institute analyzed the profound economic and social impact of biological innovation and found that biomolecules, biosystems, biomachines, and biocomputing could collectively produce up to 60 percent of the physical inputs to the global economy. The applications of this “Bio Revolution” range from agriculture (such as the production of nonanimal meat) to energy and materials, and from consumer goods (such as multi-omics tailored diets) to a multitude of health applications.

#### IP protections are key to innovation – recouping startup costs and high risk of failure

Grabowski et al 15 [(Henry, Professor of Economics, member of the faculty for the Health Sector Management Program, and Director of the Program in Pharmaceuticals and Health Economics at Duke University) “The Roles of Patents and Research And Development Incentives In Biopharmaceutical Innovation,” Health Affairs, 2/2015] JL

The essential rationale for patent protection for biopharmaceuticals is that long-term benefits in the form of continued future innovation by pioneer or brand-name drug manufacturers outweigh the relatively short-term restrictions on imitative cost competition associated with market exclusivity. Regardless, the entry of other branded agents remains an important source of therapeutic competition during the patent term.

Several economic characteristics make patents and intellectual property protection particularly important to innovation incentives for the biopharmaceutical industry. **5** The R&D process often takes more than a decade to complete, and according to a recent analysis by Joseph DiMasi and colleagues, per new drug approval (including failed attempts), it involves more than a billion dollars in out-of-pocket costs. **6** Only approximately one in eight drug candidates survive clinical testing. **6**

As a result of the high risks of failure and the high costs, research and development must be funded by the few successful, on-market products (the top quintile of marketed products provide the dominant share of R&D returns). **7**,**8** Once a new drug’s patent term and any regulatory exclusivity provisions have expired, competing manufacturers are allowed to sell generic equivalents that require the investment of only several million dollars and that have a high likelihood of commercial success. Absent intellectual property protections that allow marketing exclusivity, innovative firms would be unlikely to make the costly and risky investments needed to bring a new drug to market.

Patents confer the right to exclude competitors for a limited time within a given scope, as defined by patent claims. However, they do not guarantee demand, nor do they prevent competition from nonidentical drugs that treat the same diseases and fall outside the protection of the patents.

New products may enter the same therapeutic class with common mechanisms of action but different molecular structures (for example, different statins) or with differing mechanisms of action (such as calcium channel blockers and angiotensin receptor blockers). 9 Joseph DiMasi and Laura Faden have found that the time between a first-in-class new drug and subsequent new drugs in the same therapeutic class has been dramatically reduced, from a median of 10.2 years in the 1970s to 2.5 years in the early 2000s. 10 Drugs in the same class compete through quality and price for preferred placement on drug formularies and physicians’ choices for patient treatment.

Patents play an essential role in the economic “ecosystem” of discovery and investment that has developed since the 1980s. Hundreds of start-up firms, often backed by venture capital, have been launched, and a robust innovation market has emerged. **11** The value of these development-stage firms is largely determined by their proprietary technologies and the candidate drugs they have in development. As a result, the strength of intellectual property protection plays a key role in funding and partnership opportunities for such firms.

#### Biopharmaceutical innovation is key to prevent future pandemics and bioterror.

Marjanovic and Feijao 20 [(Sonja Marjanovic, Ph.D., Judge Business School, University of Cambridge. Carolina Feijao, Ph.D. in biochemistry, University of Cambridge; M.Sc. in quantitative biology, Imperial College London; B.Sc. in biology, University of Lisbon.) "How to Best Enable Pharma Innovation Beyond the COVID-19 Crisis," RAND Corporation, 05-2020, https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PEA407-1.html] TDI

As key actors in the healthcare innovation landscape, pharmaceutical and life sciences 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 context.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 competition 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 pharmaceutical 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 sector. 2 It is therefore unsurprising that we are seeing industry-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 compounds to assess their utility in the fight against COVID19; screening existing compound libraries in-house or with partners to see if they can be repurposed; accelerating trials 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 accelerate 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 relatively few companies that are ‘commercial’ winners. Those who might gain substantial revenues will be under pressure 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 combination product that is being tested for therapeutic potential 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, bioterrorism 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 immediate term. The pharmaceutical industry has responded to previous public health emergencies associated with infectious 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 contributions 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 innovation conditions.

#### Extinction – defense is wrong

Piers Millett 17, Consultant for the World Health Organization, PhD in International Relations and Affairs, University of Bradford, Andrew Snyder-Beattie, “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity”, Health Security, Vol 15(4), http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/hs.2017.0028

Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3 while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world’s population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization.

A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to remote populations, overcome rare genetic resistances, and evade detection, cures, and countermeasures. Even evolution itself may work in humanity’s favor: Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off, and so evolutionary pressures could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6

While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they do not rule the possibility out entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of species going extinct due to disease—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include native American tribes exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and theWestern Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population).

In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But many diseases are proof of principle that each worst-case attribute can be realized independently. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, natural evolution would be an unlikely source for pathogens with the highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach. But advances in biotechnology might allow the creation of diseases that combine such traits. Recent controversy has already emerged over a number of scientific experiments that resulted in viruses with enhanced transmissibility, lethality, and/or the ability to overcome therapeutics.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-2

## 1NC – Case

### Framing

**The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing**

1. **First, pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. People consistently regard pleasure and pain as good reasons for action, despite the fact that pleasure doesn’t seem to be instrumentally valuable for anything.**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues**.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values**.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable**.** You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes**:** “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.

1. **Moreover, *only* pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. All other values can be explained with reference to pleasure; Occam’s razor requires us to treat these as instrumentally valuable.**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

I think several things should be said in response to Moore’s challenge to hedonists. First, **I do not think the burden of proof lies on hedonists to explain why the additional values are not intrinsic values. If someone claims that X is intrinsically valuable, this is a substantive, positive claim, and it lies on him or her to explain why we should believe that X is in fact intrinsically valuable.** Possibly, this could be done through thought experiments analogous to those employed in the previous section. Second, **there is something peculiar about the list of additional intrinsic values** that counts in hedonism’s favor**: the listed values have a strong tendency to be well explained as things that help promote pleasure and avert pain.** To go through Frankena’s list, life and consciousness are necessary presuppositions for pleasure; activity, health, and strength bring about pleasure; and happiness, beatitude, and contentment are regarded by Frankena himself as “pleasures and satisfactions.” The same is arguably true of beauty, harmony, and “proportion in objects contemplated,” and also of affection, friendship, harmony, and proportion in life, experiences of achievement, adventure and novelty, self-expression, good reputation, honor and esteem. Other things on Frankena’s list, such as understanding, **wisdom, freedom, peace, and security, although they are perhaps not themselves pleasurable, are important means to achieve a happy life, and as such, they are things that hedonists would value highly.** **Morally good dispositions and virtues, cooperation, and just distribution of goods and evils, moreover, are things that, on a collective level, contribute a happy society, and thus the traits that would be promoted and cultivated if this were something sought after.** To a very large extent, the intrinsic values suggested by pluralists tend to be hedonic instrumental values. Indeed, pluralists’ suggested intrinsic values all point toward pleasure, for while the other values are reasonably explainable as a means toward pleasure, pleasure itself is not reasonably explainable as a means toward the other values. Some have noticed this. Moore himself, for example, writes that though his pluralistic theory of intrinsic value is opposed to hedonism, its application would, in practice, look very much like hedonism’s: “Hedonists,” he writes “do, in general, recommend a course of conduct which is very similar to that which I should recommend.”24 Ross writes that “[i]t is quite certain that by promoting virtue and knowledge we shall inevitably produce much more pleasant consciousness. These are, by general agreement, among the surest sources of happiness for their possessors.”25 Roger Crisp observes that “those goods cited by non-hedonists are goods we often, indeed usually, enjoy.”26 What Moore and Ross do not seem to notice is that their observations give rise to two reasons to reject pluralism and endorse hedonism. The first reason is that if **the suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values are potentially explainable by appeal to just pleasure and pain** (which, following my argument in the previous chapter, we should accept as intrinsically valuable and disvaluable), **then—by appeal to Occam’s razor—we have at least a pro tanto reason to resist the introduction of any further intrinsic values and disvalues. It is ontologically more costly to posit a plurality of intrinsic values and disvalues, so in case all values admit of explanation by reference to a single intrinsic value and a single intrinsic disvalue, we have reason to reject more complicated accounts.** **The fact that suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values tend to be hedonistic instrumental values does not, however, count in favor of hedonism solely in virtue of being most elegantly explained by hedonism; it also does so in virtue of creating an explanatory challenge for pluralists.** The challenge can be phrased as the following question: **If the non-hedonic values suggested by pluralists are truly intrinsic values in their own right, then why do they tend to point toward pleasure and away from pain?**27

1. **Moral uncertainty means preventing extinction should be our highest priority.  
   Bostrom 12** [Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)]  
   These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ **Our present understanding of axiology might** well **be confused. We may not** nowknow — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet **be able to imagine the best ends** of our journey. **If we are** indeedprofoundly **uncertain** about our ultimate aims,then we should recognize that **there is a great** option **value in preserving** — and ideally improving — **our ability to recognize value and** to **steer the future accordingly. Ensuring** that **there will be a future** version of **humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value.** To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.
2. **Reducing the risk of extinction is always priority number one.   
   Bostrom 12** [Faculty of Philosophy and Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford.], Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.  Forthcoming book (Global Policy). MP. [http://www.existenti...org/concept.pdf](http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.pdf)Even if we use the most conservative of these estimates, which entirely ignores the   possibility of space colonization and software minds, **we find that the expected loss of an existential   catastrophe is greater than the value of 10^16 human lives**.  **This implies that the expected value of   reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least a hundred times the   value of a million human lives.**  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 10  54 humanbrain-emulation subjective life-years (or 10  52  lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even   more starkly.  Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a   technologically mature civilization a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that the expected   value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth   a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives. **One might consequently argue that even the tiniest reduction of existential risk has an   expected value greater than that of the definite provision of any ordinary good, such as the direct   benefit of saving 1 billion lives.**  And, further, that the absolute value of the indirect effect of saving 1  billion lives on the total cumulative amount of existential riskâ€”positive or negativeâ€”is almost   certainly larger than the positive value of the direct benefit of such an action.

#### Capitalism is sustainable and improves living standards – turns their value to life argument

Bailey ’16 (Ronald; 12/16/16; B.A. in Philosophy and B.A. Economics from the University of Virginia, member of the Society of Environmental Journalists and the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, citing a compilation of interdisciplinary research; Reason, “Is Economic Growth Environmentally Sustainable?” <http://reason.com/archives/2016/12/16/is-economic-growth-environmentally-sust1)>

Is economic growth environmentally sustainable? No, say a group of prominent ecological economists led by the Australian hydrologist James Ward. In a new PLoS ONE article—"Is Decoupling GDP Growth from Environmental Impact Possible?"—they offer an analysis inspired by the 1972 neo-Malthusian classic The Limits to Growth. They even suggest that The Limits to Growth's projections with regard to population, food production, pollution, and the depletion of nonrenewable resources are still on track. In other words, they think we're still heading for a collapse. I think **they're wrong**. But they're wrong in an instructive way. The authors describe two types of "decoupling," relative and absolute. Relative decoupling means that economic growth increases faster than rates of growth in material and energy **consumption** and **environmental impact**. Between 1990 and 2012, for example, China's **GDP rose 20-fold** while its energy use increased by a factor of four and its material use by a factor of five. Basically this entails increases in efficiency that result in using fewer resources to produce more value. Absolute decoupling is what happens when continued economic growth actually **lessens resource use** and impacts on the natural environment, that is, creating more value while using less stuff. Essentially humanity becomes richer while withdrawing from nature. To demonstrate that continued economic growth is unsustainable, the authors recycle the hoary I=PAT model devised in 1972 by the Stanford entomologist and population alarmist Paul Ehrlich and the Harvard environmental policy professor (and chief Obama science adviser) John Holdren. Human Impact on the environment is supposed to equal to Population x Affluence/consumption x Technology. All of these are presumed to intensify and worsen humanity's impact on the natural world. In Ward and company's updated version of I=PAT, the sustainability of economic growth largely depends on Technology trends. Absolute decoupling from resource consumption or pollutant emissions requires technological intensity of use and emissions to decrease by at least the same annual percentage as the economy is growing. For example, if the economy is growing at three percent per year, technological intensity must reduce 20-fold over 100 years to maintain steady levels of resource consumption or emissions. If technological intensity is faster then resource use and emissions will decline over time, which would result in greater wealth creation with ever lessening resource consumption and environmental spillovers. Once they've set up their I=PAT analysis, Ward and his colleagues assert that "for non-substitutable resources such as land, water, raw materials and energy, we argue that whilst efficiency gains may be possible, there are minimum requirements for these resources that are ultimately governed by physical realities." Among the "physical realities" they mention are limits on plant photosynthesis, the conversion efficiencies of plants into meat, the amount of water needed to grow crops, that all supposedly determine the amount of agricultural land required to feed humanity. They also cite "the upper limits to energy and material efficiencies govern minimum resource throughput required for economic production." To illustrate the operation of their version of the I=PAT equation, they apply it to a recent study that projected it would be possible for Australia's economy to grow 7-fold while simultaneously reducing resource and energy use and lowering environmental pressures through 2050. They **crank the notion** that there are nonsubstitutable physical limits on material and energy resources through their equations until 2100, and they find that eventually consumption of both rise at the same rate as economic growth. QED: Economic growth is unsustainable. Or as they report, "Permanent decoupling (absolute or relative) is impossible for essential, non-substitutable resources because the efficiency gains are ultimately governed by physical limits." **Malthus wins again!** Or does he? GDP growth—increases in the monetary value of all finished goods and services—is a crude measure for improvements in human well-being. Nevertheless, rising incomes (GDP per capita) correlate with lots of good things that nearly everybody wants, including access to more and better **food**, longer and **healthier lives**, more educational **opportunities**, and greater scope for life choices. Ward and his colleagues are clearly right that there is only so much physical stuff on the Earth, but even they know that wealth is not created simply by using more stuff. Where they go wrong (as so many Malthusians do) is by implicitly assuming that there are limits to human creativity. Interestingly, Ward and his colleagues, like Malthus before them, focus on the supposed limits to **agricultural productivity**. For example, they cite the limits to photosynthesis, which will limit the amount of food that humanity can produce. But as they acknowledge, human population may not continue to increase. In fact, **global fertility rates** have been **decelerating** for many decades now, and demographer Wolfgang Lutz calculates that world population will peak after the middle of this century and begin falling. Since the number of mouths to feed will stabilize and people can eat only so much, it is unlikely that the **biophysical limits** of agriculture on Earth will be exceeded. But it gets even better. Agricultural **productivity is improving**. Consider the biophysical limit on photosynthesis cited by the study. In fact, researchers are already making progress on installing more efficient C-4 photosynthesis into rice and wheat, which would **boost yields by** as much as **50 percent**. British researchers just announced that they had figured out how to boost photosynthetic efficiency to create a super-wheat would increase yields by 20 percent. In a 2015 article for the Breakthrough Journal, "The Return of Nature: How Technology Liberates the Environment," Jesse H. Ausubel of Rockefeller University reviews how humanity is **already decoupling** in many ways from the natural world. "A series of 'decouplings' is occurring, so that our economy no longer advances in tandem with exploitation of land, forests, water, and minerals," he writes. "American use of almost everything except information **seems to be peaking**." He notes that agricultural applications of fertilizer and water in the U.S. peaked in the 1980s while yields continued to increase. Thanks to increasing agricultural productivity, humanity is already at **"peak farmland"**; as a result, "an area the size of India or of the United States east of the Mississippi could be released globally from agriculture over the next 50 years or so." Ward is worried about biophysical limits on water use. But as Ausubel notes, U.S. **water use has peaked** and has declined **below the level of 1970**. What about meat? Ausubel notes the **greater efficiency** with which chickens and cultivated fish turn grains and plant matter into meat. In any event, the future of farming is not fields but factories. Innovators are already seeking to replace the entire dairy industry with milk, yogurt, and cheeses made by genetically modified bacteria grown in tanks. Others are figuring how to culture meat in vat. Ausubel also notes that many countries have already been through or are about to enter the "forest transition," in which forests begin to expand. Roger Sedjo, a forest economist at Resources of the Future, has projected that by the middle of this century most of world's **industrial wood** will be produced from planted forests covering a remarkably small land area, perhaps **only 5 to 10 percent** of the extent of today's global forest. Shrinking farms and ranches and expanding forests will do a lot toward turning around the alarming global reduction in wildlife. How about unsubstitutable stuff? Are we running out of that? Ausubel notes that the U.S. has apparently already achieved **absolute decoupling**—call it peak stuff—for a lot of materials, including plastics, paper, timber, phosphate, aluminum, steel, and copper. And he reports relative decoupling for **53** other **commodities**, all of which are likely heading toward absolute decoupling. Additive manufacturing is also known as 3-D printing, in which machines build up new items one layer at a time. The Advanced Manufacturing Office suggested that additive manufacturing can reduce material needs and costs by up to **90 percent**. And instead of the replacement of worn-out items, their material can **simply be recycled** through a printer to return it to good-as-new condition using only 2 to 25 percent of the energy required to make new parts. 3-D printing on demand will also eliminate storage and inventory costs, and will significantly cut transportation costs. Nanomanufacturing—building atom-by-atom—will likely engender a **fourth industrial revolution** by spurring exponential economic growth while reducing human demands for material resources. Ward and company project that Australians will be using 250 percent more energy by 2100. Is there an upper limit to energy production that implies unsustainability? In their analysis, the ecological economists apparently assume that energy supplies are limited. Why this is not clear, unless their model **implicitly assumes** a growing **consumption** of fossil fuels (and even then, the world is not close to running out of those). But there is a source of energy that, for all practical purposes, is limitless and has few deleterious environmental effects: **nuclear power**. If demand for primary energy were to double by 2050, a back-of-the-envelope calculation finds that the **entire world's energy needs** could be supplied by 6,000 conventional nuclear power plants

The deployment of fast reactors would supply "renewable" energy for thousands of years. The development of thorium reactors could also supply **thousands of years** of energy. And both could do so without harming the environment. (Waste heat at that scale would not be much of a problem.) Such power sources are in any relevant sense "decoupled" from the natural world, since their fuel cycles produce **little pollution**. Recall that GDP measures the monetary value of all finished goods and services. Finished goods will become a shrinking part of the world's economy as more people gain access to food, clothing, housing, transportation, and so forth. Already, services account for 80 percent of U.S. GDP and 80 percent of civilian employment. Instead of stuff, people will want to spend time creating and enjoying themselves. As technological progress enables economic growth, people will consume more pixels and less petroleum, more massages and less mortar, more handicrafts and less hardwood. Ultimately, Ward and his colleagues make the **same mistake as Malthus** and the Limits to Growth folks: They **extrapolate trends** without taking adequate account of human **ingenuity**. Will it be possible to grow the economy 7-fold over this century while reducing resource consumption and restoring the natural world? Yes.

### Advantage

#### COVID inevitable even with vaccines – antibodies fade and high transmissibility

Zhang 20 [(Sarah, staff writer at The Atlantic, winner of a 2018 AAAS Kavli Science Journalism Silver Award) “The Coronavirus Is Never Going Away,” The Atlantic, 8/4/2020] JL

The coronavirus is simply too widespread and too transmissible. The most likely scenario, experts say, is that the pandemic ends at some point—because enough people have been either infected or vaccinated—but the virus continues to circulate in lower levels around the globe. Cases will wax and wane over time. Outbreaks will pop up here and there. Even when a much-anticipated vaccine arrives, it is likely to only suppress but never completely eradicate the virus. (For context, consider that vaccines exist for more than a dozen human viruses but only one, smallpox, has ever been eradicated from the planet, and that took 15 years of immense global coordination.) We will probably be living with this virus for the rest of our lives.

Back in the winter, public-health officials were more hopeful about SARS-CoV-2, the coronavirus that causes COVID-19. SARS, a closely related coronavirus, emerged in late 2002 and infected more than 8,000 people but was snuffed out through intense isolation, contact tracing, and quarantine. The virus was gone from humans by 2004. SARS and SARS-CoV-2 differ in a crucial way, though: The new virus spreads more easily—and in many cases asymptomatically. The strategies that succeeded with SARS are less effective when some of the people who transmit COVID-19 don’t even know they are infected. “It’s very unlikely we’re going to be able to declare the kind of victory we did over SARS,” says Stephen Morse, an epidemiologist at Columbia University.

If not, then what does the future of COVID-19 look like? That will depend, says Yonatan Grad, on the strength and duration of immunity against the virus. Grad, an infectious-disease researcher at Harvard, and his colleagues have modeled a few possible trajectories. If immunity lasts only a few months, there could be a big pandemic followed by smaller outbreaks every year. If immunity lasts closer to two years, COVID-19 could peak every other year.

At this point, how long immunity to COVID-19 will last is unclear; the virus simply hasn’t been infecting humans long enough for us to know. But related coronaviruses are reasonable points of comparison: In SARS, antibodies—which are one component of immunity—wane after two years. Antibodies to a handful of other coronaviruses that cause common colds fade in just a year. “The faster protection goes away, the more difficult for any project to try to move toward eradication,” Grad told me.

This has implications for a vaccine, too. Rather than a onetime deal, a COVID-19 vaccine, when it arrives, could require booster shots to maintain immunity over time. You might get it every year or every other year, much like a flu shot.

Even if the virus were somehow eliminated from the human population, it could keep circulating in animals—and spread to humans again. SARS-CoV-2 likely originated as a bat virus, with a still-unidentified animal perhaps serving as an intermediate host, which could continue to be a reservoir for the virus. (SARS also originated in bats, with catlike palm civets serving as an intermediate host—which led officials to order the culling of thousands of civets.) Timothy Sheahan, a virologist at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, wonders if, with SARS-CoV-2 so widespread across the globe, humans might be infecting new species and creating new animal reservoirs. “How do you begin to know the extent of virus spread outside of the human population and in wild and domestic animals?” he says. So far, tigers at the Bronx Zoo and minks on Dutch farms seem to have caught COVID-19 from humans and, in the case of the minks, passed the virus back to humans who work on the farm.

The existence of animal reservoirs that can keep reinfecting humans is also why scientists don’t speak of “eradication” for these viruses. The Ebola virus, for example, probably comes from bats. Even though human-to-human transmission of Ebola eventually ended in the West African epidemic in 2016, the virus was still somewhere on Earth and could still infect humans if it found the right host. And indeed, in 2018, Ebola broke out again in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Ebola can be contained through contact tracing, isolation, and a new vaccine, but it cannot be “eradicated.” No one is quite sure why SARS has never reemerged from an animal reservoir, but this coronavirus could well follow a different pattern.

#### Waivers don’t improve vaccine supply or distribution, but do allow for poorly made vaccines that undermine vaccine confidence

Delgado 5/25 [(Carla, health & culture journalist who’s written for Insider, Architectural Digest, Elemental, Observer, and Mental Floss) “Experts Say Patent Waivers Aren't Enough To Increase Global Vaccination,” Verywell Health, 5/25/2021] JL

“Waiving intellectual property rights for COVID-19 vaccines is likely to only have a modest impact on global vaccine supply,” William Moss, MD, executive director of the International Vaccine Access Center at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, tells Verywell. “A vaccine IP waiver is not in itself likely to lead to increased vaccine production in less developed countries because much more needs to be in place to increase the global vaccine supply.”

For several countries outside of the U.S. that have the necessary equipment to produce mRNA vaccines effectively and safely, the IP waiver can be of great help. However, many more countries lack this capacity, and this move still leaves them behind.

“The majority of the world’s countries lack the capacity to produce and distribute COVID-19 vaccines, and especially at the scale required to get this pandemic under control,” Richard Marlink, MD, director of the Rutgers Global Health Institute, tells Verywell. “They need funding, manufacturing facilities, raw materials, and laboratory staff with the technological expertise required.”

We've already seen what can go wrong with substandard vaccine manufacturing. In April, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) inspected the Emergent BioSolutions factory in Baltimore and consequently shut down their production after concerning observations, which include:3

The factory was not maintained in a clean and sanitary condition.

Waste handling was found to be inadequate because generated waste was transported through the warehouse before disposal, which can potentially contaminate other areas.

Employees were seen dragging unsealed bags of medical waste from the manufacturing area across the warehouse.

Peeling paint, paint flecks, loose particles/debris were observed. There were also damaged floors and rough surfaces that cannot be properly cleaned and sanitized.

Employees were seen removing their protective garments where raw materials were staged for manufacturing.

They reportedly spoiled about 15 million doses of the Johnson and Johnson COVID-19 vaccine, and more than 100 million doses are on hold as regulators inspect them for possible contamination.4

“Vaccines are complex biological products, much more complex than drugs, and need to be produced by manufacturers and in facilities with the highest quality control standards,” Moss says. “Adverse events associated with a poorly made or contaminated batch of vaccines would have a devastating impact on vaccine confidence.”

In a statement last October, Moderna announced that they will not enforce their COVID-19-related patents against those who will make vaccines during this pandemic.5 While waiving some vaccine patents may allow third-party manufacturers to make and sell COVID-19 vaccines, the transfer of skills and technology that will allow them to manage production isn't very simple.

For instance, a spokesperson for Pfizer said that the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine required 280 different components sourced from 86 suppliers across various countries. Manufacturing the vaccine would require highly specialized equipment and complex technology transfers.6

“Technology transfer also would need to be a critical component to expand vaccine manufacturing by other companies as an IP waiver is insufficient to provide the ‘know how’ needed to manufacture mRNA or adenovirus-vectored COVID-19 vaccines,” Moss says. “And supply chains for the reagents, supplies, and equipment would be needed.”

Interested manufacturers would need to have the proper equipment to test the quality and consistency of their manufacturing. At present, the World Health Organization (WHO) has plans to facilitate the establishment of technology hubs to transfer "a comprehensive technology package and provide appropriate training" to manufacturers from lower- and middle-income countries.7

While waiving vaccine patents is necessary, it's likely not enough. Additionally, negotiations about it are still ongoing. Even though the U.S. supports the waiver of COVID-19 vaccine patents, other countries like the United Kingdom, Japan, and Germany oppose it.8

It's also important to remember that manufacturing vaccines is only one step of the process of vaccinating the global population—distributing it is yet another hurdle.

“Many countries are counting on COVAX, a global collaboration to distribute COVID-19 vaccines more equitably around the world,” Marlink says. “The single largest supplier to COVAX is in India, where exports have been suspended since March due to the country’s COVID-19 crisis.”

#### TRIPs waiver is a symbolic gesture that prevents vaccine production and distribution

Ikenson 6/25 [(Dan, former director of the Cato Institute's Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies, MA in economics from George Washington University) “Stop Blaming Patents For The World’s Low Vaccination Rates,” Forbes, 6/25/2021] JL

The premise of the need for a TRIPS waiver is simply absurd. It serves to divert attention from the failures of governments to protect their citizens with smart public health policies and, importantly, to demonize intellectual property protections more broadly. Governments are already free to waive IP protections and to engage in compulsory licensing in times of health crises but have not done so because patents are not the bottleneck. The bottlenecks result from limited global expertise in the highly technical process of producing the vaccine, the dearth of production facilities and capacity to ramp up production at existing facilities, the tight supply of crucial pharmaceutical ingredients (including vials, bags, and other components), and the limited distribution channels through which the proper handling of vaccines at proper temperatures can be assured.

To be sure, global health officials and biopharmaceutical companies have been working to resolve these real bottlenecks—a process that has benefited significantly from the fact that U.S. officials have more bandwidth to devote more attention and other resources to these matters precisely because U.S. vaccination efforts have been successful. And why have they been successful? In large measure, they have been successful because intellectual property protections have bred expectations of future intellectual property protections, which has invited and enabled an accumulation of R&D investment, infrastructure, and expertise in the United States.

The effort to surmount these real impediments to producing, distributing, and injecting vaccines is not made any easier by a symbolic waiver of IP protections—and may be made more difficult. The volume of vaccines necessary to ending the pandemic requires governments and public health officials to coordinate and focus on ramping up the capacity to produce and distribute, and to safeguard against the squandering of pharmaceutical ingredients by ensuring those inputs are channeled to producers with expertise in manufacturing and distribution. On the contrary, suspending IP protection might encourage novice firms with no expertise to end up wasting limited, essential ingredients.

#### Waivers antagonize drug-makers and manufacturers which reduces vaccine production

Furlong 4/21 [(Ashleigh, health care reporter for POLITICO, based in London, former reporter at the science policy publication Research Fortnight who covered biomedical research policy) “Why waiving patents might not boost global access to coronavirus vaccines,” Politico EU, 4/21/2021] JL

Lifting IP rules may make it pretty straightforward to make some types of drugs where technology transfer isn’t important, said ‘t Hoen. For example, during the pandemic, both Hungary and Russia have issued compulsory licenses for remdesivir, with both countries then producing the drug. But that’s not true for vaccines.

A vaccine patent prevents another company from producing the same product. But even without a patent in the way, the company that produced the vaccine holds an enormous amount of relevant know-how that it's not going to turn over f

or free. So when drugmakers make deals with other manufacturers to produce their vaccine, they transfer this knowledge along under strict agreements. For example, AstraZeneca reached a licensing agreement with the Serum Institute of India last June that ensured that SII treats AstraZeneca as a priority customer in return for access to the technology behind the Oxford/AstraZeneca vaccine.

Compulsory licensing may also be an over-hyped solution, aside from removing the possibility of being sued for patent infringement, says Guilherme Cintra, director of innovation policy at the International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers and Associations, a pharma lobby. It could actually be "an antagonistic move," he added. "In a way it removes trust, and undermines the possibility of engaging in good faith to build up manufacturing."

#### The plan alienates pharma companies and doesn’t solve lack of vaccine purchasing

Glassman 5/6 [(Amanda, executive vice president and senior fellow at the Center for Global Development, research focuses on priority-setting, resource allocation and value for money in global health, former director for global health policy at the Center from 2010 to 2016, former deputy director of the Global Health Financing Initiative at Brookings and carried out policy research on aid effectiveness and domestic financing issues in the health sector in low-income countries, MSc from the Harvard School of Public Health) “Big Pharma Is Not the Tobacco Industry,” Barrons, 5/6/2021] JL

In fact, several of them did just that in the pandemic: invested their own money to develop patented manufacturing technologies in record time. Those technologies are literally saving the world right now. Public funding supported research and development, but companies also brought their own proprietary ingenuity and private investments to bear toward solving the world’s singular, collective challenge. Their reward should be astronomical given the insane scale of the health and economic benefits these highly efficacious vaccines produce every day. Market incentives sent a clear signal that further needed innovation—greater efficacy, single doses, more-rapid manufacturing, updated formulations, fast boosters, and others—would be richly rewarded. Market incentives could also have been used to lubricate supply lines and buy vaccines on behalf of the entire world; with enough money, incredible things can happen.

But activist lobbying to waive patents—a move the Biden administration endorsed yesterday—sends exactly the opposite signal. It says that the most important, valuable innovations will be penalized, not rewarded. It tells innovators, don’t bother attacking the most important global problems; instead, throw your investment dollars at the next treatment for erectile disfunction, which will surely earn you a steady return with far less agita.

It is worth going back to first principles. What problem are we trying to solve? We have highly efficacious vaccines that we would like to get out to the entire world as quickly as possible to minimize preventable disease and deaths, address atrocious inequities, and enable the reopening of society, trade, and commerce. Hundreds of millions of people have been plunged into poverty over the past year; in the developing world, the pandemic is just getting started.

What is the quickest way to get this done? Vaccine manufacturing is not just a recipe; if you attack and undermine the companies that have the know-how, do you really expect they’ll be eager to help you set up manufacturing elsewhere? Is the plan to march into Pfizer and force its staff to redeploy to Costa Rica to build a new factory? Do the U.S. administration or activists care that this decision could take years to negotiate at the World Trade Organization, and will likely be litigated for years thereafter? Does it make sense to eliminate the incentive for private companies to invest in vaccine R&D or in the response to the next health emergency? And if the patent waiver is only temporary and building a factory takes months or years, will anyone bother to do so, even if they could?

No, none of it makes sense. Worse still, we could solve the policy problem more easily by harnessing market incentives for the global good by ponying up cash to vaccinate the entire world. No confiscation necessary.

The big problem is that countries have not bought enough vaccine to inoculate most of their populations. Covax, buying on behalf of 91 lower-income countries, is only collecting enough funding to cover 20% of their population. In many parts of the world, such as the Middle East, sub-Saharan Africa and some countries in Latin America, we see very low levels of vaccine prepurchasing. We have seen this week that the government of India had not ordered enough vaccine to cover its own population, for example, resulting in export bans on its domestic vaccine manufacturers; nor has it approved the Pfizer vaccine. Our collective focus instead must be to make the market: to set up advance purchase agreements to establish demand via country cooperation, Covax, and the multilateral development banks.