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#### Pleasure and pain are the starting point for moral reasoning—they’re our most baseline desires and the only things that explain the intrinsic value of objects or actions

Moen 16, Ole Martin (PhD, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo). "An Argument for Hedonism." Journal of Value Inquiry 50.2 (2016): 267. SM

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 relations that ground Pettit’s theory.

#### That outweighs their justifications on probability—simpler beliefs are more likely to be true and external standards collapse to pleasure and pain.

#### Consequentialism is true—[A] All actions are forward-looking, so intentions are constituted by foreseen consequences. [B] No act omission distinction---choosing to omit is an act itself – people psychologically decide not to act.

#### Thus, the standard is *Maximizing Pleasure Minimizing Pain*. Calc indicts don’t link—my framework is a general principle to be applied intuitively, not a rigid calculator. Prefer—

#### [1] Death outweighs—agents cannot act if they fear for their bodily security—my framework constrains every NC.

#### [2] Brain studies disprove personal identity.

Parfit ’84Derek Parfit, Reasons and Persons (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984). – GV SK

Some recent medical cases provide striking evidence in favour of the Reductionist View. Human beings have a lower brain and two upper hemispheres, which are connected by a bundle of fibres. In treating a few people with severe epilepsy, surgeons have cut these fibres. The aim was to reduce the severity of epileptic fits, by confining their causes to a single hemisphere. This aim was achieved. But the operations had another unintended consequence. The effect, in the words of one surgeon, was the creation of ‘two separate spheres of consciousness.’ This effect was revealed by various psychological tests. These made use of two facts. We control our right arms with our left hemispheres, and vice versa. And what is in the right halves of our visual fields we see with our left hemispheres, and vice versa. When someone’s hemispheres have been disconnected, psychologists can thus present to this person two different written questions in the two halves of [their] visual field, and can receive two different answers written

#### If nothing unifies agency from one second to the next, then only states of consciousness can matter—that’s util.

#### [3] Actor-Spec – States are institutions and not agents with intentions so non-consequentialist impacts are incoherent—outweighs since different agents have different ethical obligations. Also takes out calc indict since governments use util all the time.

#### [4] Use modesty—we are limited by logical errors and sensory limitations so there’s always a risk we are wrong.

#### [5] Presume util—If you’re unsure about deontological obligations then default to util since there’s always good in making the world a better place.

#### [6] Existential risk comes first under any framework

**Ord 20** Toby Ord [Australian philosopher. He founded Giving What We Can, an international society whose members pledge to donate at least 10% of their income to effective charities], “The Precipice” Hachette Books, 2020 // Lex CH [Recut by Lex AKo]

But **an existential catastrophe is not** just **a catastrophe that destroys a particularly large number of lives. It destroys our potential**. My mentor, Derek Parfit, asked us to imagine a devastating nuclear war killing 99 percent of the world’s people.19 **A war that would leave behind a dark age lasting centuries, before the survivors could eventually rebuild civilization to its former heights; humbled, scarred—but undefeated. Now compare this with a war killing a full 100 percent of the world’s people. This second war would be worse, of course, but how much worse? Either war would be the worst catastrophe in history. Either would kill billions.** **The second war would involve tens of millions of additional deaths, and so would be worse for this reason**. But there is another, far more significant difference between the two wars. **Both wars kill billions of humans; but the second war kills humanity**. **Both wars destroy our present; but the second war destroys our future. It is this qualitative difference in what is lost with that last percent that makes existential catastrophes unique, and that makes reducing the risk of existential catastrophe uniquely important. 20 In expectation, almost all humans who will ever live have yet to be born.** Absent catastrophe, **most generations are future generations.** As the writer Jonathan Schell put it: The procession of generations that extends onwards from our present leads far, far beyond the line of our sight, and, compared with these stretches of human time, which exceed the whole history of the earth up to now, our brief civilized moment is almost infinitesimal. Yet we threaten, in the name of our transient aims and fallible convictions, to foreclose it all. **If our species does destroy itself, it will be a death in the cradle—a case of infant mortality**. 21 And because, in expectation, **almost all of humanity’s life lies in the future, almost everything of value lies in the future as well**: almost all the flourishing; almost all the beauty; our greatest achievements; our most just societies; our most profound discoveries. 22 We can continue our progress on prosperity, health, justice, freedom and moral thought. **We can create a world of wellbeing and flourishing that challenges our capacity to imagine. And if we protect that world from catastrophe, it could last millions of centuries**. This is our potential—what we could achieve if we pass the Precipice and **continue striving for a better world**. **It is this view of the future—the immense value of humanity’s potential —that most persuades me to focus my energies on reducing existential risk. When I think of the millions of future generations yet to come, the importance of protecting humanity’s future is clear to me**. **To risk destroying this future**, for the sake of some advantage limited only to the present, **seems** to me profoundly parochial and **dangerously short-sighted**. Such neglect privileges a tiny sliver of our
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#### **U.S dominance over biotech now BUT Misguided policy cedes control to China.**

Gupta 6/11 [“As Washington Ties Pharma's Hands, China Is Leaping Ahead.”, Gaurav Gupta, Opinion | America Risks Ceding Its Biotech Dominance to China | Barron's, Barrons, 11 June 2021, [www.barrons.com/articles/as-washington-ties-pharmas-hands-china-is-leaping-ahead-51623438808](http://www.barrons.com/articles/as-washington-ties-pharmas-hands-china-is-leaping-ahead-51623438808)., Gaurav Gupta, a physician, is the founder of the biotechnology investment firm Ascendant BioCapital.]//Lex AKu

There should be no doubt that we are living at the dawn of a golden age of biomedical innovation. The American scientific engine that produced Covid-19 vaccines in record time was fueled by a convergence of advances in genomics, biomarkers, data science, and manufacturing years in the making. The first Food and Drug Administration approvals of a host of new product formats—oligonucleotide, bispecific, oncolytic virus, CAR-T, and lentivirus/AAV—all took place within the last decade. These represent an unprecedented expansion of the armamentarium that physicians have at their disposal to treat and cure disease. In the last few years, [47% of all new medicines](https://www.efpia.eu/media/554521/efpia_pharmafigures_2020_web.pdf) were invented by U.S. biopharma companies, with [homegrown startups](https://www.cbo.gov/publication/57126) driving the majority of innovation. The bulk of the remainder were developed by foreign companies specifically for the U.S. market. An indirect benefit of these trends is that most novel therapeutics undergo clinical development and early commercial launch here in the U.S. The rest of the world understands that the American patient has earlier and broader access to groundbreaking therapies via these mechanisms. Indeed, the past decade is filled with examples of medical “firsts” for American patients: the first cure for Hepatitis C, the first gene therapy for blindness, the first immunotherapy for cancer. Future rewards will be greater still if we preserve our current system of incentivizing and protecting The remarkable innovation capacity of our biopharmaceutical industry ought to be a source of national pride. Yet while “Made in America” is the global standard for medicines in development today, misguided policy risks ceding our scientific prowess to other countries in the future. This is particularly true in the case of China, where biotechnology has become a strategic pillar for the health of its people and economy. From 2016 to 2020, the market capitalization of all Chinese biopharma companies increased exponentially from [$1 billion to over $200 billion](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-03-01/xi-mobilizes-china-for-tech-revolution-to-cut-dependence-on-west). China saw over [$28 billion](https://www.bioworld.com/articles/506978-china-sees-five-year-highs-in-life-sciences-investments-and-partnering) invested in its life sciences sector in 2020, double the previous year’s amount. Returns on China’s investment are already arriving. The FDA approved a drug developed in China for the first time ever in 2019. While China’s innovation capacity currently remains behind America’s, my experiences as a biopharma professional make it clear they are doing everything they can to catch up and catch up fast. In fact, when I speak to Chinese biotechnology executives, they boast that they can run clinical trials faster than their U.S. counterparts. The danger of misguided policies that disincentivize pharmaceutical innovation in the U.S. is effectively driving that same innovation to China. If we close off the market in the U.S. at the same time that China is opening its market to innovative new products, then we will see companies choose to first launch impactful novel medicines in China, based on clinical trials conducted in China. Because the FDA rarely accepts data generated entirely outside the U.S., this relocation of research capacity will negatively affect Americans’ access to cutting-edge therapies. The biotechnology field is advancing rapidly. Promising technologies such as targeted protein degradation and gene editing are perhaps not far from being developed into impactful medicines, and the U.S. risks these technologies being mastered by Chinese companies.

#### The plan chills American biomed innovation, ceding control to China – also can’t solve future diseases

Paulsen 7/9 [ERIK PAULSEN: We can save the world with our vaccines — without surrendering our IP to China," Bakersfield Californian, [https://www.bakersfield.com/opinion/erik-paulsen-we-can-save-the-world-with-our-vaccines-without-surrendering-our-ip-to/article\_b0b87692-df61-11eb-9a13-d7fa02eefaee.html]//Lex](https://www.bakersfield.com/opinion/erik-paulsen-we-can-save-the-world-with-our-vaccines-without-surrendering-our-ip-to/article_b0b87692-df61-11eb-9a13-d7fa02eefaee.html%5d//Lex) AKu

The Biden administration gave Beijing a gift when it endorsed a petition before the World Trade Organization to force the American developers of Covid-19 vaccines and therapeutics to relinquish their intellectual property rights to these medicines. The Chinese government seeks to take over in biotech, a sector where U.S. innovators lead. Biotech is included in its “Made in China 2025” plan, which lists 10 sectors that China aims to dominate. The government intends to force anyone doing business in China in those spheres to hand over know-how. Surrendering IP protections on biomedical technology has dire consequences. Foremost, it guts the foundation of biomedical innovation, which takes huge investments spanning many years to bear fruit. IP protections assure innovators that they can recover those investments and make a profit. Losing IP protection would have a chilling effect on investments in the sector. Equally injurious to America, the IP waiver would allow China to become a biotech powerhouse by piggybacking on American innovation. A waiver on IP for Covid-19 vaccines would accelerate the timeline for “Made in China 2025**.**” The mRNA technology, which undergirds the Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccines has uses beyond this pandemic. It has the potential to take on cancers and other diseases. With the waiver, China and others will be emboldened to use the once-proprietary mRNA know-how for broader research and applications. Is this in America’s interest? Mark Cohen**,** an expert on Chinese IP theft**,** recentlytold the Washington Post that the waiver would deliver **“**a competitive advantage to countries that are increasingly viewed as our adversaries, at taxpayer expense.” Beyond the damage that an mRNA giveaway will inflict on US R&D investments, the waiver sends a signal that America could agree to force American innovators to part with trade secrets every time there’s a global crisis. That attitude will arrest biopharmaceutical innovation. Small biotech firms spearhead 70 percent of the R&D pipeline, relying heavily on private investors to fund that work. If investors know that innovators may have to give away their discoveries in a global crisis, they’ll deploy their money elsewhere. That’ll make it even harder to draw the R&D investments needed to address infectious diseases, including drug-resistant infections and viruses. America is benefitting greatly from the early access to COVID-19 treatments and vaccines, saving lives and speeding economic recovery. Preserving U.S. leadership in biomedical innovation includes preserving the incentives that helped make it the world’s leader. A final downside of the waiver is the ability for American firms to find a cure for the next pandemic. Among the greatest threats is bacteria resistant to our current arsenal of antibiotics that becomes a pandemic-inducing superbug. Already, the market for new antimicrobials is broken**.** Only a handful of biotechs have them in development, and many have gone bankrupt trying to commercialize one. “A lot of people have rightly said we need to start thinking about preparing for the next pandemic now,” noted Craig Garthwaite, a healthcare-business professor at Northwestern University. “Suspending IP for vaccine manufacturers would send exactly the wrong signal for the future.**”** For the sake of patients everywhere, American IP rights must stay protected. It’s the only way to keep China at bay and American innovators at work.

#### Biotech leadership key to future military primacy.

Moore 21 [(Scott Moore is a political scientist and administrator at the University of Pennsylvania and the author of a forthcoming book, “How China Shapes the Future,” on China’s role in public goods and emerging technologies.) 8-8-2021, "In Biotech, the Industry of the Future, the U.S. Is Way Ahead of China," Lawfare, https://www.lawfareblog.com/biotech-industry-future-us-way-ahead-china]//Lex AKu

A [continuing refrain](https://phys.org/news/2020-10-america-edge-peril.html) from Washington in recent years has been that the United States is falling behind China in the development of critical emerging technologies. In some fields, this may be true. But not in biotechnology. To be sure, China’s biotech sector is growing at a torrid pace, and some of its firms are becoming leaders in [certain areas](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/FP_20200427_china_biotechnology_moore.pdf), such as cancer treatment. Yet the U.S. retains a dominant position in research, development and commercialization, accounting for [almost half](https://itif.org/publications/2018/03/26/how-ensure-americas-life-sciences-sector-remains-globally-competitive) of all biotech patents filed from 1999 to 2013. The triumph of its biotechnology industry during the coronavirus pandemic, producing two highly effective vaccines using an entirely new approach based on [messenger RNA](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/different-vaccines/mrna.html), and in record time, shows that the U.S.’s competitive edge in biotechnology remains largely intact. And that has important implications as Washington gears up for a sustained period of geopolitical competition with Beijing. Biotech is such a critical area for technological competition between the U.S. and China because it is transforming fields from medicine to military power. The great advances of the 19th century, like chemical fertilizers, resulted from mastering chemistry. In the 20th century, mastery of physics led to nuclear energy—and, more ominously, nuclear weapons. In the 21st century, biology offers a similar mix of peril and promise. This was illustrated dramatically by the award of the 2020 Nobel Prize for the discovery of an enzyme system known as CRISPR-Cas9, which allows an organism’s genomes to be edited with high precision. It is a transformational breakthrough. But while CRISPR shows great promise in the development of [new cures](https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-03476-x) for long-untreatable diseases, it could also lead to a whole new generation of [deadly bioweapons](https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/11/08/cloning-crispr-he-jiankui-china-biotech-boom-could-transform-lives-destroy-them/). That’s a prospect that increasingly alarms U.S. intelligence officials. In 2016, then-Director of National Intelligence James Clapper [warned Congress](https://www.technologyreview.com/s/600774/top-us-intelligence-official-calls-gene-editing-a-wmd-threat/) that “[r]esearch in genome editing conducted by countries with different regulatory or ethical standards than those of western countries probably increases the risk of the creation of potentially harmful biological agents or products.” Although Clapper didn’t name specific countries, it soon became clear that he was referring mainly to China. Four years later, his successor, John Ratcliffe, issued a far more [pointed warning](https://www.wsj.com/articles/china-is-national-security-threat-no-1-11607019599) that “China has even conducted human testing on members of the People’s Liberation Army in hope of developing soldiers with biologically enhanced capabilities. There are no ethical boundaries to Beijing’s pursuit of power.” Such capabilities are almost certainly only speculative—but they underscore why biotech leadership is so important for national security as well as economic competitiveness. Beijing has long envied the United States’s dominant position in biotechnology and spent heavily to overtake it. Biotech has been a priority sector for state investment since the 1980s, and by [one estimate](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/FP_20200427_china_biotechnology_moore.pdf) Beijing had poured some $100 billion into the sector by 2018. Nowhere did it lavish more attention or invest more of its propaganda power than in developing a coronavirus vaccine. State media have spent months [crowing](https://www.globaltimes.cn/content/1190615.shtml) that “China is working around the clock for breakthroughs in COVID-19 vaccines.” Yet despite this push, China’s vaccine program quickly took on a Potemkin air. In February 2020, barely two months after the onset of the pandemic and after a supposedly crash vaccine effort, a military doctor stood in front of a Chinese flag to receive what was billed as an experimental vaccine dose but was widely suspected to be a [staged photo op](https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2020/11/global-push-covid-19-vaccines-china-aims-win-friends-and-cut-deals). Now, having [spent months](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/01/13/business/chinese-vaccine-brazil-sinovac.html) talking up its two primary vaccine candidates to developing countries like Brazil and Indonesia, both of which have entered into purchase agreements with Chinese biotech firms, Chinese officials face [severe mistrust](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/01/13/business/chinese-vaccine-brazil-sinovac.html) among their nation’s overseas partners. For China’s leaders, the disappointing returns on their big bet on biotechnology look likely to cause them more headaches at home as well as abroad—there are [already signs](https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2020/11/global-push-covid-19-vaccines-china-aims-win-friends-and-cut-deals) that affluent Chinese place more trust in foreign-developed coronavirus vaccines than the homegrown ones produced at such great expense. For U.S. officials, though, China’s relative underperformance in vaccine development presents an opportunity to reassert the United States’s leadership in biotechnology and public health and bolster the nation’s depleted soft power in the process. The Biden administration has already signaled it will reengage in multilateral bodies such as the World Health Organization. Yet the U.S. shouldn’t stop there. Washington should begin thinking now about how to emulate the success of the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR)—which, though imperfect, is widely regarded as one of the most successful single public health interventions in history—to address growing disparities in access to coronavirus vaccines between countries. At the moment, vaccine supplies are controlled largely by rich countries, creating the risk of moral and public health failure if the gap persists. While COVID-19, the respiratory disease caused by the novel coronavirus, differs in many respects from AIDS, PEPFAR combined research, prevention, and access to therapeutics. Developing a comparable institutional structure to close the coronavirus vaccine access gap is the right thing to do—but it would also go a long way to restoring America’s battered global reputation. At the same time, the United States can’t afford to rest on its laurels in biotechnology, or any other field. Aside from China, other nations like Singapore and Israel have also invested heavily to develop their biotechnology sectors, with Israel in particular giving rise to a thriving biotech industry. U.S. public investment in basic scientific research and development has meanwhile [been on the decline](https://www.wsj.com/articles/how-the-u-s-surrendered-to-china-on-scientific-research-11555666200) for decades, and there are worrying signs that America’s once world-beating innovation ecosystem is less productive, and less entrepreneurial, than it once was. Despite strengths in translational research, moreover, the frontiers of biology increasingly sit at the [intersection with other disciplines](https://www.startus-insights.com/innovators-guide/biotech-innovation-map-reveals-emerging-technologies-startups/) like computer science, meaning that funding agencies, universities and other organizations need to break down disciplinary silos. Boosting support for biotechnology research, while reforming how that money is used, will go a long way toward shoring up the United States’s leading position in the global biotech sector. The U.S. biotechnology sector also faces other threats, not least growing espionage and intellectual property theft by foreign actors, especially those linked to China. Several high-profile cases brought by the U.S. Department of Justice’s China Initiative have involved biotechnology researchers, and American biotech firms have been [top targets](https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/chinese-and-russian-hackers-targeting-78355/) for cyber theft and intrusion. Sustained outreach to researchers and research institutions is critical to preventing such theft. But efforts to clamp down on the threats posed by espionage and intellectual property theft can easily go too far and must preserve the researcher mobility and data-sharing that is essential to doing cutting-edge science. Beyond its shores, the United States should work with its partners and allies to enhance export controls on dual-use biotechnology—used for both peaceful and military gain—especially DNA templates. Many forms of genetic material and synthetic biology products are [already subject](https://www.bis.doc.gov/index.php/documents/regulations-docs/2332-category-1-materials-chemicals-microorganisms-and-toxins-4/file) to U.S. export controls, but gaps remain, and screening for genetic sequence orders relies primarily on voluntary regulation by biotech firms. Better coordinating export controls among major economies and U.S. allies can dramatically reduce the risk of sophisticated bioweapons development in the decades to come.

#### Heg solves arms races, land grabs, rogue states, and great power war.

Brands 18 [Hal, Henry Kissinger Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies and a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments." American Grand Strategy in the Age of Trump." Page 129-133]

Since World War II, the United States has had a military second to none. Since the Cold War, America has committed to having overwhelming military primacy. The idea, as George W. Bush declared in 2002, that America must possess “strengths beyond challenge” has featured in every major U.S. strategy document for a quarter century; it has also been reflected in concrete terms.6 From the early 1990s, for example, the United States consistently accounted for around 35 to 45 percent of world defense spending and maintained peerless global power-projection capabilities.7 Perhaps more important, U.S. primacy was also unrivaled in key overseas strategic regions—Europe, East Asia, the Middle East. From thrashing Saddam Hussein’s million-man Iraqi military during Operation Desert Storm, to deploying—with impunity—two carrier strike groups off Taiwan during the China-Taiwan crisis of 1995– 96, Washington has been able to project military power superior to anything a regional rival could employ even on its own geopolitical doorstep. This military dominance has constituted the hard-power backbone of an ambitious global strategy. After the Cold War, U.S. policymakers committed to averting a return to the unstable multipolarity of earlier eras, and to perpetuating the more favorable unipolar order. They committed to building on the successes of the postwar era by further advancing liberal political values and an open international economy, and to suppressing international scourges such as rogue states, nuclear proliferation, and catastrophic terrorism. And because they recognized that military force remained the ultima ratio regum, they understood the centrality of military preponderance. Washington would need the military power necessary to underwrite worldwide alliance commitments. It would have to preserve substantial overmatch versus any potential great-power rival. It must be able to answer the sharpest challenges to the international system, such as Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990 or jihadist extremism after 9/11. Finally, because prevailing global norms generally reflect hard-power realities, America would need the superiority to assure that its own values remained ascendant. It was impolitic to say that U.S. strategy and the international order required “strengths beyond challenge,” but it was not at all inaccurate. American primacy, moreover, was eminently affordable. At the height of the Cold War, the United States spent over 12 percent of GDP on defense. Since the mid-1990s, the number has usually been between 3 and 4 percent.8 In a historically favorable international environment, Washington could enjoy primacy—and its geopolitical fruits—on the cheap. Yet U.S. strategy also heeded, at least until recently, the fact that there was a limit to how cheaply that primacy could be had. The American military did shrink significantly during the 1990s, but U.S. officials understood that if Washington cut back too far, its primacy would erode to a point where it ceased to deliver its geopolitical benefits. Alliances would lose credibility; the stability of key regions would be eroded; rivals would be emboldened; international crises would go unaddressed. American primacy was thus like a reasonably priced insurance policy. It required nontrivial expenditures, but protected against far costlier outcomes.9 Washington paid its insurance premiums for two decades after the Cold War. But more recently American primacy and strategic solvency have been imperiled. THE DARKENING HORIZON For most of the post–Cold War era, the international system was— by historical standards—remarkably benign. Dangers existed, and as the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, demonstrated, they could manifest with horrific effect. But for two decades after the Soviet collapse, the world was characterized by remarkably low levels of great-power competition, high levels of security in key theaters such as Europe and East Asia, and the comparative weakness of those “rogue” actors—Iran, Iraq, North Korea, al-Qaeda—who most aggressively challenged American power. During the 1990s, some observers even spoke of a “strategic pause,” the idea being that the end of the Cold War had afforded the United States a respite from normal levels of geopolitical danger and competition. Now, however, the strategic horizon is darkening, due to four factors. First, great-power military competition is back. The world’s two leading authoritarian powers—China and Russia—are seeking regional hegemony, contesting global norms such as nonaggression and freedom of navigation, and developing the military punch to underwrite these ambitions. Notwithstanding severe economic and demographic problems, Russia has conducted a major military modernization emphasizing nuclear weapons, high-end conventional capabilities, and rapid-deployment and special operations forces— and utilized many of these capabilities in conflicts in Ukraine and Syria.10 China, meanwhile, has carried out a buildup of historic proportions, with constant-dollar defense outlays rising from US$26 billion in 1995 to US$226 billion in 2016.11 Ominously, these expenditures have funded development of power-projection and antiaccess/area denial (A2/AD) tools necessary to threaten China’s neighbors and complicate U.S. intervention on their behalf. Washington has grown accustomed to having a generational military lead; Russian and Chinese modernization efforts are now creating a far more competitive environment. Second, the international outlaws are no longer so weak. North Korea’s conventional forces have atrophied, but it has amassed a growing nuclear arsenal and is developing an intercontinental delivery capability that will soon allow it to threaten not just America’s regional allies but also the continental United States.12 Iran remains a nuclear threshold state, one that continues to develop ballistic missiles and A2/AD capabilities while employing sectarian and proxy forces across the Middle East. The Islamic State, for its part, is headed for defeat, but has displayed military capabilities unprecedented for any terrorist group, and shown that counterterrorism will continue to place significant operational demands on U.S. forces whether in this context or in others. Rogue actors have long preoccupied American planners, but the rogues are now more capable than at any time in decades. Third, the democratization of technology has allowed more actors to contest American superiority in dangerous ways. The spread of antisatellite and cyberwarfare capabilities; the proliferation of man-portable air defense systems and ballistic missiles; the increasing availability of key elements of the precision-strike complex— these phenomena have had a military leveling effect by giving weaker actors capabilities which were formerly unique to technologically advanced states. As such technologies “proliferate worldwide,” Air Force Chief of Staff General David Goldfein commented in 2016, “the technology and capability gaps between America and our adversaries are closing dangerously fast.”13 Indeed, as these capabilities spread, fourth-generation systems (such as F-15s and F-16s) may provide decreasing utility against even non-great-power competitors, and far more fifth-generation capabilities may be needed to perpetuate American overmatch. Finally, the number of challenges has multiplied. During the 1990s and early 2000s, Washington faced rogue states and jihadist extremism—but not intense great-power rivalry. America faced conflicts in the Middle East—but East Asia and Europe were comparatively secure. Now, the old threats still exist—but the more permissive conditions have vanished. The United States confronts rogue states, lethal jihadist organizations, and great-power competition; there are severe challenges in all three Eurasian theaters. “I don’t recall a time when we have been confronted with a more diverse array of threats, whether it’s the nation state threats posed by Russia and China and particularly their substantial nuclear capabilities, or non-nation states of the likes of ISIL, Al Qaida, etc.,” Director of National Intelligence James Clapper commented in 2016. Trends in the strategic landscape constituted a veritable “litany of doom.”14 The United States thus faces not just more significant, but also more numerous, challenges to its military dominance than it has for at least a quarter century.
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#### CP Text: The member nations of the World Trade Organization should form an intellectual property system that uses tax credits and grants for medicines.

#### Solves high prices and innovation.

Abramowicz 19 [Abramowicz, Michael B., Prize and Reward Alternatives to Intellectual Property (2019). Prize and Reward Alternatives to Intellectual Property, in Research Handbook on the Economics of Intellectual Property Law (P.S. Menell & B. Depoorter eds., forthcoming 2019). ; GWU Law School Public Law Research Paper No. 2019-13; GWU Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2019-13. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/ abstract=3366608] //Lex VM and Lex AKo

1. Grants Most of this chapter has compared traditional intellectual property systems to a range of possible prize or reward systems. But these are, of course, not the only means by which the government can encourage innovation. An approach closely related to that of rewards is grants. Grant decisions are made by centralized agencies ex ante based on research proposals. Adler (2011) argues that prize or reward systems may be preferable, because the centralized grant decisions limit “the range of promising ventures that may receive funding.” Hanson (1998) argues that grants have become more important than prizes because they tend to concentrate power in the hands of scientific rather than political leaders. While legislatures would like to maintain such power in their own hands, the power to administer prizes is more likely executive than legislative, and legislatures prefer to grant power to scientific leaders than to the executive. The general normative case for grants, particularly for basic research, is that “a large share of the most valuable uses of basic research will take highly abstract, intangible forms, rendering the output of such research highly nonexcludable.” Kapczynski & Syed (2013, p. 1951). 2. Governmental Purchases and Tax Credits Above, we noted that the government might create something akin to a prize system by giving coupons to low-income consumers. There may also be other ways by which the government can help consumers obtain patented products in a way that reduces deadweight loss, yet possibly without the need to evaluate the contributions of individual inventions. For example, the U.S. government subsidizes health insurance through its tax code. Roin (2014, p. 1051) argues that this may be administratively much simpler than giving coupons to individual consumers. Health insurance creates a two-part pricing scheme for pharmaceuticals. Consumers pay a fixed amount for health insurance and then a copayment for individual prescriptions. This copayment may be relatively close to marginal cost. Roin also argues that the government might combine subsidies for health insurance with price controls to ensure that the consumer price ends up relatively close to marginal cost. Many national health systems help to drive prices for consumers to levels near marginal cost without creating a formal prize system. The effect, he argues, is to create the benefits of a patent buyout scheme while retaining the system of intellectual property and arguably reducing the informational demands on the government. It may not be easy to apply the same logic outside the health insurance context, though in principle a combination of private ordering and governmental subsidies could reduce consumer costs for other goods. Consumers often buy goods (such as cable television subscriptions) with a high fixed and low marginal price component, and government policy could further encourage this. We have, of course, only scratched the surface of the ways in which the government can create innovation through its own purchases. Carroll (2009, p. 1369-70) offers an expanded taxonomy of means by which the government can encourage innovation, noting the possibility of “direct provision of creators or innovators employed by the government.” Kalil (2006, p. 7) argues that a benefit of prize-and-reward systems it that they avoid the complexities associated with procurement regulations and can thus attract teams who otherwise would not be positioned to do business with the government. Brennan et al. (2012, p. 27) offer some guidance on when procurement may be appropriate. While grants will be useful when the government wishes to reduce the risks of inventors but does not know the best approach to take, procurement will work better for a known objective and solution. Prizes may reduce risk somewhat and may be especially appropriate where a specific objective is known but the means to obtain that objective is unknown. Hemel and Ouellette (2013) argue that tax credits also have potential advantages as means of funding innovation. Tax credits require less direct governmental involvement and supervision than any of the other methods of encouraging innovation. Tax credits, they argue “may be optimal where potential innovators have private information about project prospects and limited access to outside capital.” (p. 303) Tax credits can be structured as deductions or as refundable, which provides stronger incentives for startup companies. Tax credits can either be administered at a national level or at a state level. Hrdy (2013) argues that in part because a variety of doctrines limit the ability of states to create patent policies, states have focused largely on providing tax credits as a mechanism for encouraging innovation. As Hrdy’s argument suggests, a significant drawback of tax credits relative to rewards is that they provide the government relatively little ability to adjust for ways in which the patent system may not align private and social incentives.

## Case

#### The WTO can’t enforce the aff- causes circumvention.

Lamp 19 [Nicholas; Assistant Professor of Law at Queen’s University; “What Just Happened at the WTO? Everything You Need to Know, Brink News,” 12/16/19; <https://www.brinknews.com/what-just-happened-at-the-wto-everything-you-need-to-know/>] Justin

Nicolas Lamp: For the first time since the establishment of the WTO in 1995, the Appellate Body cannot accept any new appeals, and that has knock-on effects on the whole global trade dispute settlement system. When a member appeals a WTO panel report, it goes to the Appellate Body, but if there is no Appellate Body, it means that that panel report will not become binding and will not attain legal force.

The absence of the Appellate Body means that members can now effectively block the dispute settlement proceedings by what has been called appealing panel reports “into the void.”

The WTO panels will continue to function as normal. When a panel issues a report, it will normally be automatically adopted — unless it is appealed. And so, even though the panel is working, the respondent in a dispute now has the option of blocking the adoption of the panel’s report. It can, thereby, shield itself from the legal consequences of a report that finds that the member has acted inconsistently with its WTO obligations.

#### States wouldn’t implement TRIPS – endless filibustering in the squo by Europe, the UK, Russia, etc. should be enough proof, but they also have no incentive to listen since countries are split on the issue, and its not unanimous

#### All aff ev is in the context of nations agreeing to the TRIPS waiver, which is distinct [explain contextual to the aff]

#### Circumvention is a neg argument – core of the topic literature is whether countries would do it which is why there are huge debates on the EU, UK, China, etc agreeing to a waiver

#### Circumvention and they don’t solve – even if they say “durable fiat”, they have not defined the scope of the plan in the 1AC so you don’t know what the plan would materially look like

Mercurio 6/24 [Simon F.S. Li Professor of Law, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong. June 24, 2021. “The IP Waiver for COVID-19: Bad Policy, Bad Precedent” <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/> Accessed 8/25 //gord0]

#### The role of intellectual property rights (IPRs) and access to medicines is contentious. On the one hand, IPRs encourage investment, innovation and the advancement of health science. On the other hand, the limited-term monopoly rights can result in artificially high prices and become a barrier to access to medicines. While the wisdom of the IPRs system has at times been tested, it has proven its value in the current COVID-19 pandemic as IPRs played a large role in the rapid (and unprecedented) development and availability of multiple vaccines. Despite the success, India and South Africa proposed that the World Trade Organization (WTO) waive IPRs under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement) in order to increase access to vaccines and other COVID-19-related technologies.[1](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn1) The proposal, tabled at a meeting of the TRIPS Council in October 2020, calls on Members to waive IPRs relating to and having an impact on the “prevention, containment or treatment of COVID-19”.[2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn2) The proposal attracted support from the majority of developing country Members,[3](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn3) but was opposed by a handful of Members including the United States (US).[4](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn4) Given that consensus could not be reached within the deadline of 90 days as set out in Art. IX:3 of the Agreement Establishing the WTO, Members agreed to keep the waiver proposal on the agenda of the TRIPS Council in 2021.[5](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn5) On 5 May 2021, the US reversed its position and announced that it would support a waiver for COVID-19 vaccines.[6](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn6) To be clear, this does not mean that the US supported the waiver as proposed by India and South Africa. Instead, the US has simply agreed to negotiate the perimeters of a waiver. Others, including the European Union (EU), Canada, Australia, Norway, Switzerland, the United Kingdom (UK) and even leading developing countries such as Brazil, Chile and Mexico remain opposed or lukewarm on the waiver.[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn7) The US dropping opposition does not mean the concerns of other Members will simply disappear – one would hope that these nations opposed the waiver for valid reasons and did not simply blindly follow the US. Indeed, many of the above-listed Members remain unconvinced that even such a draconian step as a waiver of IPRs would accomplish the goal of increased vaccine production.[8](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn8) For its part, the EU continues to favour an approach which makes better use of existing flexibilities available in the TRIPS Agreement.[9](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn9) Thus, those expecting quick agreement on the waiver will be disappointed. Negotiations at the WTO are always difficult and lengthy, and US Trade Representative Katherine Tai acknowledged that the “negotiations will take time given the consensus-based nature of the institution and the complexity of the issues involved”.[10](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn10) Issues of negotiation will include the scope of the waiver. Whereas the original proposal and its amended form extend the waiver beyond patents and vaccines to include nearly all forms of IP (i.e. copyright,[11](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn11) industrial designs and trade secrets) as well as to all “health products and technologies including diagnostics, therapeutics, vaccines, medical devices, personal protective equipment, their materials or components, and their methods and means of manufacture for the prevention, treatment or containment of COVID-19”[12](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn12) (with no requirement on how or the extent to which they are related to or useful in combatting COVID-19), the US and others seem to support a waiver limited to patents and vaccines.[13](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn13) The length of the waiver will also be a contentious negotiating issue, with proponents seeking a virtual indefinite waiver lasting until the Membership agrees by consensus that it is no longer required – meaning even a single Member’s objection to ending the waiver would mean the waiver continues to remain in force[14](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn14) – as will the request that any action claimed to be taken under the waiver is outside the scope of the WTO’s dispute settlement mechanism.[15](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn15) These provisions will almost certainly be opposed by other Members, who would perhaps agree to a time-limited waiver which could be extended rather than an unchallengeable indefinite waiver which will be difficult to reverse. The proposal also fails to mention anything in relation to transparency and notification requirements and lacks safeguards against abuse or diversion. These points will likely also prove contentious in the negotiations. With so many initial divergences and as yet undiscussed issues, the negotiations at best could be completed by the time of the next WTO Ministerial Conference, scheduled to begin on 20 November 2021. There is precedent in this regard, as previous TRIPS negotiations involving IP and pharmaceuticals were not fully resolved until the days before the Ministerial Conferences (in 2003 and 2005).[16](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn16) There is also a chance that the negotiations will continue past the calendar year 2021. The chance for a swift negotiation diminished with the release of a revised proposal by India and South Africa on 22 May 2021. As mentioned above, the proposal contains no limit as to product coverage, scope, notification requirements or safeguards and proposes that the waiver will remain in effect for what could be an indefinite period. This was not a proposal designed to engender quick negotiations and a solution. Instead, the proposal perhaps reveals India’s and South Africa’s true intent to use the COVID-19 pandemic as an excuse to roll-back IPRs rather than a good-faith effort to rapidly increase access to lifesaving vaccines and treatments around the world. It is not only the length of time which is an issue but also the ultimate impact of the waiver. A waiver simply means that a WTO Member would not be in violation of its WTO obligations if it does not protect and enforce the COVID-19-related IPRs for the duration of the waiver. The waiver would thus allow Members to deviate from their international obligations but not obligate Members to suspend protection and enforcement of the IPRs. Members like the US who support the waiver may not implement the necessary domestic legislation to waive IPRs within the jurisdiction. It is questionable whether the US could even legally implement the waiver given that IPRs are a matter of constitutional law.[17](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn17) The US announcement remains meaningful, however, for two reasons. First, it signals a departure from the longstanding and bipartisan support for the pharmaceutical industry, which for decades has been instrumental in setting the IP and trade agenda.[18](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn18) Second, it sends a strong signal that the US does not oppose others from waiving patent protection for vaccines. This shift may also be part of a broader and alternative strategy to increase vaccine production and distribution, whereby the US is not viewing or supporting waiver negotiations as a legal tool but more so as a threat to encourage vaccine innovators to increase production. In essence, the desired reaction would be that the IP holders increase efforts to license, transfer technology and expand manufacturing – exactly what the world needs at this time. Alan Beattie, writing in the Financial Times, believes that even the proponents of the waiver desire this outcome: “having talked to the proponents, [the original proposal] was always a tactical position designed to start a debate, identify possible support and flush out opponents rather than a likely outcome. To that end, it seems to have worked rather well.”[19](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn19) India’s negotiator to the TRIPS Agreement and longtime WTO staffer, Jayashree Watal, agrees, stating the proposal is an “indirect attempt to put pressure on the original manufacturers to cooperate [and license production to companies in their countries]”.[20](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn20) This view makes sense, as the proponents (and their supporters) have not even pointed to one credible instance where IPRs have blocked the production of a COVID-19 vaccine. Moreover, it is well known that the leading vaccines using mRNA are difficult to reproduce and having the “blueprints” does not guarantee safe and effective production. Simply stated, if a pastry chef provides instructions on how to bake a cake, the cake they bake is still going to be better than cakes baked by novices using the exact same recipe. The know-how and trade secrets are the key ingredient to the manufacture of quality, safe and effective pharmaceuticals or vaccines, and not only is it not transferred through compulsory licenses but it is hard to imagine how any government would force the transfer of such information even under a waiver. For this reason, instead of encouraging production everywhere – including in locations where safety and efficacy standards are virtually nonexistent – and accepting that there will be a flood of substandard vaccines coming onto the world market (with devastating effects) it is much more sensible to find out where potential manufacturing capabilities exist and find ways to exploit them and scale them up. When asked if a waiver would improve vaccine availability and equity, Watal responded: “No. It won’t. That’s clear.”[21](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn21) I share Watal’s view and do not support a TRIPS waiver for IPRs or even a limited waiver for patents. With evidence mounting that “what the proposal … will definitely not achieve is speeding up the Covid-19 vaccination rate in India or other parts of the Global South”[22](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn22) I refuse to sacrifice academic integrity by supporting a proposal simply because it is gaining traction in some circles.[23](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn23) IPRs played a key role in delivering vaccines within a year of the discovery of a new pathogen; it seems inexplicable that the world would abandon the system without any evidence that IPRs are limiting during the current crisis.[24](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn24) Moreover, innovators have been generous in licensing technology transfer and production and one would be hard-pressed to find credible reports of qualified generic producers being refused a license. This is not surprising, since multiple competing vaccines are on the market it simply does not make economic sense for innovators to refuse a license – the generic manufacturer would simply obtain a license (and market share) and pay royalties to a competitor. Instead, I support efforts to enable prompt and effective use of existing flexibilities in the TRIPS Agreement and concerted and coordinated efforts involving governments and the private sector to ensure all qualified generic producers willing and capable of manufacturing vaccines are doing so and to create supply by working to bring more facilities up to standard. Cooperation will not only lead us out of this pandemic but also put us in a better position to deal with the next one. Killing the goose that laid th TRIPS IP rights are key 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

#### Weakening patents is worse – eliminates funds for R&D and halts pharma innovations that prevents an effective development of a right to health.

Sarah Joseph 11, Professor of Human Rights Law, and the Director of the Castan Centre for Human Rights Law at Monash University, Sarah, “Blame it on the WTO?” http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199565894.001.0001/acprof-9780199565894-chapter-8#acprof-9780199565894-note-1350

IP protection restricts trade and competition, so IP clauses are somewhat anomalous in trade agreements, which are normally designed to decrease trade barriers. What is the justification for IP protection?44 Due to their relevance to this chapter, I will concentrate on arguments in favour of patents.45 Patents reward people for their inventions, thus encouraging creativity and innovation. Patents operate on the assumption that people are not inherently altruistic, and expect rewards for their endeavours, especially when those endeavours are risky as they may, and often do, result in costly failure.46 Furthermore, the money raised from patent protection is said to be necessary to fund the considerable costs of research and development (R&D).47 Therefore, without patents, innovation in the pharmaceutical field (or any industrial field) might grind to a standstill. While it is true that the high prices generated by patent protection may render access to drugs selective, (p.221) it is nevertheless better that a drug is available to some rather than non-existent and available to no one. The global extension of patent law mandated by TRIPS helps to ensure that patents are not undermined by the sale of competing pirated copies. Furthermore, global IP regimes should theoretically encourage greater technology transfer between countries, greater foreign direct investment, and greater local innovation within compliant states.48 All of these outcomes should accelerate the economic development of poor countries, with positive knock-on effects for human rights. Thus, perhaps it is arguable that pharmaceutical patents are justifiable under international human rights law, as they promote R&D which is essential for the future enhancement of rights to life and health. Furthermore, to the extent that they are held by natural persons, they are one way of protecting that person’s rights under Article 15(1)(c) of the ICESCR.

e golden egg may seem appealing to some in the short term but will only ensure that no eggs are delivered in the next pandemic.