**Framework**

I negate.

​​**I value consequentialism. The University of Texas ’17 explains,**

University of Texas. "Consequentialism - Ethics Unwrapped." Ethics Unwrapped. University of Texas. 2017. Web. 25 Oct. 2017.<http://ethicsunwrapped.utexas.edu/glossary/consequentialism>

“Consequentialism is an ethical theory that judges whether or not something is right by what its consequences are. For instance, most people would agree that lying is wrong. But if telling a lie would help save a person’s life, consequentialism says it’s the right thing to do.”

**Moral rights and wrongs are based on consequences – proves Consequentialism comes first. Johnson ‘85**

Johnson, 85(Conrad D. Johnson, 'The Authority of the Moral Agent', Journal of Philosophy 82, No 8 (August 1985), pp. 391)

If we follow the usual deontological conception, there are also well-known difficulties. If it is simply wrong to kill the innocent, the wrongness must in some wav be connected to the consequences. That an innocent person is killed must be a consequence that has some important bearing on the wrongness of the action; else why be so concerned about the killing of an innocent? Further, if it is wrong in certain cases for the agent to weigh the consequences in deciding whether to kill or to break a promise, it is hard to deny that this has some connection to the consequences. Following one line of thought, it is consequentialist considerations of mistrust that stand behind such restrictions on what the agent may take into account.3 But then again it is hard to deal with that rare case in which the agent can truly claim that his judgement about the consequences is accurate, or, in that

**Thus, the value criterion is minimizing harm.**

**Disad - Innovation**

**The aff crushes innovation in the pharma sector---incentivizes them to focus on non-important issues.**

**Glassman 21** [Amanda; 5/6/21; Executive vice president and a senior fellow at the Center for Global Development, a nonpartisan, nonprofit think tank in Washington and London; “*Big Pharma Is Not the Tobacco Industry*,” Barron,<https://www.barrons.com/articles/big-pharma-is-not-the-tobacco-industry-51620315693>] Justin

But here is the crux of the problem: The pharmaceutical industry is not the tobacco industry. They are not merchants of death. The companies are amoral and exist to make money, but their business is not fundamentally immoral. Big Pharma (mostly) develops and sells products that people need to survive and thrive. Their products improve health and welfare. Fights over access to medicines are possible because medicines exist in the first place—medicines that were usually developed by Big Pharma. And yes, the pharmaceutical industry benefits from public subsidy and publicly financed foundational research. But the **companies** also **put their** own **capital at risk to develop new products**, some of which offer **enormous public benefits**. 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.

**TRIPS IP rights are key incentive for innovation**

James **Bacchus 20**, adjunct scholar at CATO, “An Unnecessary Proposal: A WTO Waiver of Intellectual Property Rights for COVID-19 Vaccines,” December 16th, 2020, <https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines#does-novel-virus-present-novel-issues>

Technically, IP rights are exceptions to free trade. A long‐​standing general discussion in the WTO has been about when these exceptions to free trade should be allowed and how far they should be extended. The continuing debate over IP rights in medicines is only the most emotional part of this overall conversation. Because developed countries have, historically, been the principal sources of IP rights, this lengthy WTO dispute has largely been between developed countries trying to uphold IP rights and developing countries trying to limit them. The debate over the discovery and the distribution of vaccines for COVID-19 is but the latest global occasion for this ongoing discussion. The primary justification for granting and protecting **IP rights** is that they are incentives for innovation, which is the main source for long‐​term economic growth and enhancements in the quality of human life. IP rights spark innovation by “**enabling innovators to capture** enough of the **benefits of their own innovative activity** to justify taking considerable risks.”18 The **knowledge from** innovations inspired by **IP rights spills over** to inspire other innovations. The protection of **IP rights promotes** the **diffusion**, domestically and internationally, **of innovative technologies** and new know‐​how. Historically, the principal factors of production have been land, labor, and capital. In the new pandemic world, perhaps an even more vital factor is the creation of knowledge, which adds enormously to “the wealth of nations.” Digital and other economic growth in the 21st century is increasingly ideas‐​based and knowledge intensive. **Without IP rights** as incentives, **there would be less new knowledge and thus less innovation**. In the short term, undermining private IP rights may accelerate distribution of goods and services—where the novel knowledge that went into making them already exists. But in the long term, undermining private IP rights would eliminate the incentives that inspire innovation, thus preventing the discovery and development of knowledge for new goods and services that the world needs. This widespread dismissal of the link between private IP rights and innovation is perhaps best reflected in the fact that although the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals for 2030 aspire to “foster innovation,” they make no mention of IP rights.19

**Pharma innovation is key to healthcare and fighting diseases. Reducing profits kills that. Winegarden ‘16**

**Wayne Winegarden (Ph.D. is a Sr. Fellow in Business and Economics at the Pacific Research Institute and a Contributing Editor to EconoSTATS.), 7-15-2016, "How To Encourage Pharmaceutical Innovation And Why It Is Important," Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/econostats/2016/07/15/regulating-short-term-volatility-will-harm-pharmaceutical-innovation/**

In misplaced attempts to address the problems with the U.S. healthcare industry, many analysts point to specific list price increases on specialty pharmaceutical drugs to claim that high drug prices are driving overall healthcare costs ever higher. Such proclamations misdiagnose the problem with the healthcare industry and risk future innovations that can address pressing healthcare needs. It is true that the average price of medicines grew faster than average over the past two years. **Over these two years, there was also a significant increase in new medicines. In 2015, 73 new brand name drugs were introduced, 43 of which were novel therapies. This followed 74 new brand name drugs being introduced in 2014, 45 of which were novel therapies. While troubling practices by the likes of Martin Shkreli of Turing Pharmaceuticals garnered headlines, it should be expected that higher innovation comes with higher costs. And the average drug price increases accelerated during 2014 and 2015 in concert with the increase in new drugs. It is also clear that many of these new drug innovations, such as Sovaldi and Harvoni, provide immense medical benefits to patients. Patients with hepatitis C** now **have access to a 12-week treatment with a 90% cure rate–prior to these drugs, there was no cure.** Periods of higher than average price increases, followed by periods of lower price increases, should also be expected–similar to our stock price examples, price volatility happens. Perhaps more important, over the longer-run, the cost of pharmaceutical drugs have maintained a stable share of overall healthcare expenditures. Accounting for both in-patient and out-patient pharm aceutical spending, prescription drugs have been between 13% and 14% of total national health expenditures according to a study by the Altarum Institute. According to the Department of Health & Human Services (HHS), which estimates a slightly higher share of pharmaceutical spending, total drug spending has remained between 14% and 17% of total national health expenditures between 2009 and 2015. Moreover, based on the latest expenditure data from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services data, longer-term prescription drug expenditures are growing similarly to longer-term national healthcare expenditures. Between 2006 and 2015, prescription drug expenditures grew 4.1% per year, compared to 4.5% per year for overall healthcare expenditures. And, despite the surge in prescription drug expenditures over the past two years, forecasts for longer-term spending expect pharmaceutical spending to remain around its historical share of total healthcare spending. For instance, HHS predicts prescription drugs will remain just below 17% of total expenditures through 2018. Accounting for discounts, IMS health projects that price increases will return to their historical average growing between 4% and 7% a year by 2020–around the typical cost projections for overall growth in healthcare costs. In light of these data, price control proposals are particularly troubling. **Pharmaceutical price controls** will **lessen** the **incentives for future drug innovation.** The likelihood that new therapies will be created to address diseases, such as Alzheimer’s, cancer and diabetes will significantly diminish. **Pharma**ceutical **price controls will** also **not address the problems plaguing the U.S. healthcare system, therefore the problems of declining care, rising overall healthcare costs, and declining healthcare accessibility will continue unabated. Calls to target pharmaceutical drugs with price controls are misplaced. There are many problems with our current healthcare system that must be addressed. Setting long-term healthcare policies based on short-term price volatility will not effectively address these problem, however. Instead, reforms should start by restructuring the current third party payer system and focus on empowering consumers to enable a higher quality, lower cost healthcare system.**

**Decline of medical innovation risks extinction**

**Sachs** 8/17/**14**—Professor of Sustainable Development, Health Policy and Management @ Columbia University [Jeffrey D. Sachs (Director of the Earth Institute @ Columbia University and Special adviser to the United Nations Secretary-General on the Millennium Development Goals) “Important lessons from Ebola outbreak,” Business World Online, August 17, 2014, http://tinyurl.com/kjgvyro]

Ebola is the latest of many recent epidemics, also including AIDS, SARS, H1N1 flu, H7N9 flu, and others. AIDS is the deadliest of these killers, claiming nearly 36 million lives since 1981. Of course, even **larger and more sudden epidemics are possible, such as the 1918 influenza** during World War I, **which claimed 50-100 million lives** (far more than the war itself). And, though the 2003 SARS outbreak was contained, causing fewer than 1,000 deaths, the disease was on the verge of deeply disrupting several East Asian economies including China’s.There are four crucial facts to understand about Ebola and the other epidemics. First, most emerging infectious diseases are zoonoses, meaning that they start in animal populations, sometimes with a genetic mutation that enables the jump to humans. Ebola may have been transmitted from bats; HIV/AIDS emerged from chimpanzees; SARS most likely came from civets traded in animal markets in southern China; and influenza strains such as H1N1 and H7N9 arose from genetic re-combinations of viruses among wild and farm animals. **New zoonotic diseases are inevitable** as humanity pushes into new ecosystems (such as formerly remote forest regions); the food industry creates more conditions for genetic recombination; and climate change scrambles natural habitats and species interactions.Second, **once a new infectious disease appears, its spread** through airlines, ships, megacities, and trade in animal products **is likely to be extremely rapid**. These epidemic diseases are new markers of globalization, revealing through their chain of death how vulnerable the world has become from the pervasive movement of people and goods.Third, **the poor are the first to suffer and the worst affected**. The rural poor live closest to the infected animals that first transmit the disease. They often hunt and eat bushmeat, leaving them vulnerable to infection. Poor, often illiterate, individuals are generally unaware of how infectious diseases -- especially unfamiliar diseases -- are transmitted, making them much more likely to become infected and to infect others. Moreover, given **poor nutrition and lack of access to basic health services,** their **weaken**ed **immune systems are easily overcome by infections** that better nourished and treated individuals can survive. And “de-medicalized” conditions -- with few if any professional health workers to ensure an appropriate public-health response to an epidemic (such as isolation of infected individuals, tracing of contacts, surveillance, and so forth) -- make initial outbreaks more severe.Finally, **the required** medical responses, including diagnostic tools and effective **medications** and vaccines, inevitably lag behind the emerging diseases. In any event, such tools **must be continually replenished. This requires cutting-edge biotechnology, immunology, and** ultimately **bioengineering to create large-scale industrial responses** (such as millions of doses of vaccines or medicines in the case of large epidemics).

The AIDS crisis, for example, called forth tens of billions of dollars for research and development -- and similarly substantial commitments by the pharmaceutical industry -- to produce lifesaving antiretroviral drugs at global scale. Yet each breakthrough inevitably leads to the pathogen’s mutation, rendering previous treatments less effective. **There is no ultimate victory, only a constant arms race between humanity and disease-causing agents.**

**CP**

**Text: The United States federal government should: substantially increase production and global distribution of the COVID-19 vaccine, and cooperate with allies to achieve increased production and global distribution of the COVID-19 vaccine.**

**Solves better – IP rights don’t hinder vaccine cooperation, but manufacturing capacity is the current constraint.**

**Sauer 6-17 21: Sauer, Hans [Deputy General Counsel, Biotechnology Industry Organization.] “Web event — Confronting Joe Biden’s proposed TRIPS waiver for COVID-19 vaccines and treatments”** [**https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/210617-Confronting-Joe-Bidens-proposed-TRIPS-waiver.pdf?x91208&x91208**](https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/210617-Confronting-Joe-Bidens-proposed-TRIPS-waiver.pdf?x91208&x91208)**]**

**But contrary to what Lori said, there are genuine real problems in the supply chain that are not caused by patents, that are simply caused by the unavailability and the constraints on existing capacity. There is in this world such a thing as maxed-out capacity that just can’t be increased on a dime. It’s not all due to intellectual property. This is true for existing vaccines as well as for vaccine raw materials. There are trade barriers. There are export restrictions that we should all be aware of and that we need to work on. And there are very real political, I think, interests in finding an explanation for how we got to this place that absolve governments around the world from their own policy decisions that they made in the past. In the United States, again, it was the declared policy of the previous administration, as well as this one, that we would vaccinate healthy college kids and go all down the line and offer a vaccine to everybody who wants it before we start sharing any with grandmothers in Burkina Faso. That was the policy. You can agree with it or disagree with it, but that was policy. We had export restrictions in place before a lot of other countries did. And that, too, contributed to unequal access of vaccines around the world. Another thing that was predictable was that politicians and governments around the world who want to be seen as proactive, on the ball, in control, for a long time were actually very indecisive, very unsure about how to address the COVID problem, which has so many dimensions. Vaccines are only one of those. But with respect to vaccines, not many governments took decisive action, put money on the table, put bets on multiple horses, before we knew whether these vaccines would work, would be approved. And it was governments in middle-income countries who now, I think, justifiably are concerned that they’re not getting fast enough access, who didn’t have the means and who didn’t have the decision-making structure to place the same bets on multiple horses, if you will, that were placed in the relatively more wealthy, global North and global West. But there is, I think, a really good and, with hindsight, predictable explanation of how we got to this place, and I think it teaches us something about how to fix the problem going forward. So why will the waiver not work? Well, first of all, with complex technology like vaccines, Lori touched on it, reverse engineering, like you would for a small molecule drug, is much more difficult if not impossible. But it depends very much more than small molecule drugs on cooperation, on voluntary transfer of technology, and on mutual assistance. We have seen as part of the pandemic response an unprecedented level of collaborations and cooperation and no indication that IP has stood in the way of the pandemic response. The waiver proponents have found zero credible examples of where IP has actually been an obstacle, where somebody has tried to block somebody else from developing a COVID vaccine or other COVID countermeasure, right? It’s not there. Second, the myth of this vast global capacity to manufacture COVID vaccines that somehow exists out there is unsubstantiated and frankly, in my opinion, untrue. But there is no such thing as vast untapped, idle capacity that could be turned around on a dime to start making COVID vaccines within weeks or even months. This capacity needs to be built; it needs to be established. And at a time when time is of the essence to beat this pandemic, starting capacity-building discussions is helpful, but it won’t be the answer to beat this pandemic. It will be the answer if we do everything right to beating the next pandemic. And if we learn any lesson of this, and then I will stop, is that the COVID waiver as well as the situation in which we find ourselves — if anything, it’s a reminder that we definitely have to take global capacity-building more seriously than we did in the past. That is true for the global North, as well as for middle-income countries — all of whom have to dedicate themselves much more determinedly to pandemic preparedness. And there’s a need to invest both in preparedness and in public health systems that hasn’t happened in the wake of past pandemic threats. This is what we will need to do. We will need to reduce export restrictions, and we will need to rededicate ourselves to preparing for the next pandemic. As far as this pandemic goes, there are 11 vaccines around the world that are already being shot into arms, only four of which come from the global North. How many more vaccines do we want? I don’t know, maybe 11 is enough if we start making more of them. But there are manufacturers around the world who know how to do this — including in China, including in India, and including in Russia. All developed their homegrown vaccines, apparently without interference by IP rights, right? So let’s make more of those. I think that’s going to be the more practical and realistic answer to solving the problem. And we need to lean on governments to stop export controls and to dedicate themselves to more global equity.**

**Case**

**Interpretation: The affirmative may not defend a subset of medicines**

**Violation: they do**

**Specific instances don’t affirm generics – past topics prove**

**Nebel 19** (Jake Nebel, assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs, “Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution” August 12 2019, vbriefly, <https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/?fbclid=IwAR0hUkKdDzHWrNeqEVI7m59pwsnmqLl490n4uRLQTe7bWmWDO_avWCNzi14>) //triumph debate

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions. Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window. So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why. “Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons. First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural. Second, “colleges and universities” fails the [upward-entailment test](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#IsolGeneInte) for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals. Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universities generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution.

**violation – they specifiy covid vaccines**

**Standards –**

**1 – precision – debating the topic as written is key to precise engagement – anything else sets a norm of arbitrarily changing words and phrases in the res – this makes negating impossible because the neg has the burden of rejoined and the aff is a moving target. Kills fairness because the neg can never link offense into the aff –**

**2 – limits- kills neg ability to prep because there are infinite plans that can all no-link neg offense – topic  generics don’t solve because spec plans can no link them. kills fairness because under resourced debaters can’t keep up with thousands of tiny affs and kills education because we never get in depth engagement.**

**3 – ground – spec affs kill neg ground by taking away wholeres disads and counterplans – mooting neg generics sets a terrible norm that incentivizes affirmative debaters to write the tiniest, most unnegatable affs – kills fairness because aff always wins if there’s no neg lit base and kills education because the neg can’t debate the topic and is forced to read generics everyone’s already heard**

**Voters –**

**1 -- Fairness – you need fairness to evaluate debate rounds – the judge needs to vote for the better debater not the better cheater. Unfair advantages in debate rounds make decisions illegitimate and hurt our ability to access real world skills. If they try to go for “fairness bad” then just vote neg because it means you’re under no obligation to evaluate their arguments fairly.**

**2 – education – it’s a voter because it’s the reason schools fund debate and the only portable skills we gain from debate are a result of education – knowing how to discuss the merits of broad policy options has more real world implications than knowing how to go for an rvi or knowing how to defend policies that are so obscure they’d never be passed.**

**Paradigm issues –**

**1 – No RVIs**

**a] logic – you don’t get to win just for proving you’re topical**

**2 – drop the debater**

**a] logic – drop the argument doesn’t make sense – the shell indics their entire advocacy**

**Interpretation – the aff may not spec that only one nation ought to reduce IPs**

**Adding an s makes nation plural**

**Guide to Grammar 04** The Guide to Grammar and Writing is sponsored by the Capital Community College Foundation, 2004<http://guidetogrammar.org/grammar/plurals.htm>

**The plural form of most noun**s **is created simply by adding the letter s.**

**more than one** snake = snakes

more than one **ski = skis**

more than one Barrymore = Barrymores

**Violation – they only spec US**

**Standards:**

**1] Precision – their model justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning parts of words like the plural part of nations from the resolution which decks and doubles neg prep**

**2] Limits – defending plural means they have to choose nations which have common features like geopolitical factors.**

**Fairness and education  come before the AC and are independent voting issues for the round**

**Without changing capacity and technology, reducing IP protection cannot solve—COVID vaccines prove.**

**Mercurio ‘21** (Bryan Mercurio; Chinese University of Hong Kong - Faculty of Law, ; 2-12-2021; "Wto Waiver From Intellectual Property Protection For Covid-19 Vaccines And Treatments: A Critical Review (February 12, 2021)”; Virginia Journal Of International Law Online (Forthcoming 2021), Available At Ssrn: [Https://Ssrn.Com/Abstract=3789820](https://ssrn.com/Abstract=3789820) Or [Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.2139/Ssrn.3789820](http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/Ssrn.3789820)";<https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3789820>)

Second, **the proposed waiver will** do **not**hing to **address the problem of lack of capacity** or the transfer **of technology** and goodwill. **Pharma**ceutical companies **have not applied for patents** **in** the **majority of developing countries** – in such countries, **any manufacturer is free to produce** **and market the vaccine** inside the territory of that country or to export the vaccine to other countries where patents have not been filed.33 **Patents cannot be the problem** **in** the **countries** **where no patent** applications **have been filed**, but **the lack of production** in such countries **points to the real problem** – these **countries lack manufacturing capacity** and capability. While **advanced pharma**ceutical companies **will have** the **tech**nology, know-how and readiness to manufacture, store and transport complex vaccine formulations, such factories and logistics exist in only a handful of countries.34 **Regardless of whether an IP waiver is granted**, the **remaining countries will be left without enhanced vaccine access** and still reliant on imported supplies. With **prices for the vaccine already very low**, it is **doubtful that generic suppliers will be able to provide the vaccine at significantly lower prices**. Under such a scenario, the benefit of the waiver would go not to the countries in need but to the generic supplier who would not need to pay the licence fee or royalty to the innovator. Thus**, the waiver would** simply serve to **benefit advanced** generic **manufacturers,** most of which are located in a handful of countries, including China and Brazil as well as (unsurprisingly) India and South Africa. Countries would perhaps be better off obtaining the vaccine from suppliers that have negotiated a voluntary licence from the patent holder, as such licences include provisions for the transfer of technology, know-how and ongoing quality assurance support.

**Removing IPP will not help vaccine apartheid and instead decrease the amount of medicine Lancu ’21**

No Evidence That Patents Slow Vaccine Access - STAT.” *STAT*, 13 Apr. 2021, www.statnews.com/2021/04/13/no-evidence-patents-slow-vaccine-access/. Accessed 30 June 2021.

‌

at this point in the exhausting and deadly Covid-19 pandemic, people around the globe are giving thanks for the multiple vaccines that have been produced and authorized in record time. All governments now share the goal of quick and worldwide vaccination. To reach this goal, many are latching onto the idea of suspending intellectual property rights for Covid-19 vaccines and medicines, including more than 400 health, labor, religious, and other groups. Late last year, the governments of India and South Africa petitioned the World Trade Organization to waive patent protections for Covid-19 therapies. **To take effect, that proposal would have to be approved by member countries and, so far, the United States, the United Kingdom, the European Union, Japan, and others have withheld their approval. But international organizations, like Doctors Without Borders, as well as a number of U.S. lawmakers, support the call to strip away patent rights for Covid-19 vaccines and therapies. President Biden is reportedly weighing whether to back the waiver. Proponents of the idea say it would boost vaccine supply and access. The problem is, there is no evidence for this claim. In fact, the push by India and South Africa appears to be disingenuous, aimed not at curbing the pandemic but at allowing domestic companies to make money off of others’ intellectual property**. Gutting patent rights is a dangerous prospect. Drug invention is highly risky: Fewer than 12% of new molecular entities that make it to the clinical trial stage get to the marketplace. The endeavor depends on $100 billion in annual private-sector investment, on top of billions in taxpayer money. Kill the patents taken out on these advances and you kill the incentive to invest. That would mean even worse trouble when the next pandemic comes around, in five, 10, or 20 years. **The issues about making more vaccines and distributing them to every country are far more complex than those proposing to waive intellectual property rights on these vaccines would have us believe. Manufacturing and distributing these vaccines is extremely complicated, posing issues well beyond patents.** Almost every factory on the planet that can make these vaccines is already doing so. One of the biggest, the Serum Institute in India, has contracts with AstraZeneca and others to make millions of doses. Under deals like these, manufacturing plants in India will produce 3.6 billion doses of vaccine this year, second only to the United States. Other companies have licensed their manufacturing process to subcontractors, and even to competitors. Johnson & Johnson and Merck are teaming up to expand manufacturing capacity of the J&J vaccine. Novartis and Sanofi are using their facilities to help increase the production of the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine. **In short, there’s robust collaboration and cooperation within the industry to ensure that vaccines are made quickly and safely. And patents actually facilitate such cooperation, because each entity can rest assured that its proprietary technology is protected in the long run.** So before rushing to disrupt the world’s intellectual property systems, governments need to identify specific evidence that intellectual property protection is actually a problem. Adar Poonawalla, CEO of the Serum Institute of India, told The Guardian that insufficient license-granting by patent holders is not an impediment to speedy vaccine rollout and that “it just takes time to scale up,” pointing to the complexity of the manufacturing process. And Bill Gates, the mega-philanthropist whose foundation spearheads many global vaccination efforts, recently told the “Sway” podcast, “Believe me, IP did not limit anything.” On the contrary**, intellectual property rights made it possible for research scientists to make the decades of investments required to develop and deliver safe and effective Covid-19 vaccines in record time**. Companies would not share such critical technology with competitors if the law didn’t protect their investments. Some of those advocating for patent waivers have their hearts in the right place: They want to end the pandemic. But the evidence that setting aside patent protection will do anything to boost access or expand supply just isn’t there. **Removing intellectual property protections on medicines will only ensure that we have fewer of them in the future**. This is not a risk worth taking, especially when the evidence suggests we don’t need to.
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‌But is China’s hegemonic accession inevitable?  This is the question being asked by a small, but growing, chorus of futurists; and their arguments are rather persuasive, too.  What follows is an examination of China’s potential (or lack thereof), and an argument that the Middle Kingdom’s internal problems are too numerous to be considered lightly.  Since the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) is engaged in a desperate balancing act in an effort to maintain China’s renaissance (and thus, its hold on power), these problems could seriously derail the nation’s growth, and its prospects of obtaining global hegemony right along with it. This paper, therefore, will examine the China thesis’ lack of viability.  While the U.S. may in fact be in decline, an ironic twist of fate has left China’s rise dependent on the stability of the U.S. market.  Moreover, the anticipated Chinese hegemony lacks theoretical support; and finally, it simply is not feasible in practical terms.  Consequently, this paper will first examine U.S.-Chinese economic interdependence in the context of U.S. hegemonic decline.  This will be followed by a discussion of HST and an analysis of China’s rise through a theoretical lens.  After it briefly explores the China thesis’ lack of practical viability in terms of demographic decline and environmental degradation, this paper will ultimately conclude that China cannot be the next hegemon.