# 1AC

## 1AC – Advantage

### Advantage – Overdoses

#### TW/CW: Non-graphic discussions of drug overdoses, specifically opioids.

#### Drug Overdoses from opioids are rooted in patents – they incentivize companies to market and prescribe them which leads to huge levels of addiction

Vertinsky 8-2 [Liza Vertinsky, Associate Professor, Project Leader for Global Health Law & Policy Project, Global Health Faculty Fellow, Emory University School of Law, 8-2-2021, “To Address the Overdose Epidemic, Tackle Pharma Industry Influence” The Harvard Law Petrie-Flom Center, Accessed 8-18-2021, <https://blog.petrieflom.law.harvard.edu/2021/08/02/opioids-pharma-regulatory-capture/> ww

A recently released government report estimates that 93,000 people died from drug overdose in 2020. This estimate reflects a jump in the death toll of almost 30% from 2019 to 2020, with opioids as a primary driver.¶ In response, President Biden has called for historic levels of funding for the treatment and prevention of addiction and drug overdose.¶ Transforming mental health and addiction services is a critical part of tackling the overdose crisis, but it is not enough, on its own, to address this epidemic, or to prevent a future one. We must also alter the conditions that fueled expanded use, and abuse, in the first place. As I argue in Pharmaceutical (Re)capture, a forthcoming article in the Yale Journal of Health Policy, Law and Ethics, this includes a change in how we regulate markets for prescription drugs.¶ To truly combat the epidemic, I suggest, we have to understand how pain became such a lucrative business and how regulators failed to protect the public health as the market for prescription opioids grew. Then, we need to put this understanding to work in the redesign of pharmaceutical regulation.¶ Although an increase in the illegal use of synthetic opioids, such as fentanyl, accounts for many of the current overdose deaths, the overdose epidemic has its roots in the increased prescribing of opioids. As I describe in a case study of the opioid epidemic, these are drugs that have been developed through the direct and indirect use of public funds, incentivized by government grants of patent, data, and market exclusivities, approved for use by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, prescribed by state-licensed physicians, paid for by highly regulated public and private insurers, and otherwise subject to government approval and oversight. I show how this epidemic emerged as the result of an intertwined evolution of medical approaches to treating pain, growth of the business of treating pain, and patient beliefs about the appropriate treatment of pain, an evolution largely driven by those with the largest financial stakes in opioid prescriptions and sales.¶ Pharmaceutical (Re)capture provides a framework for understanding the multi-faceted ways in which the largest industry players influence the operation of pharmaceutical markets, and uses this framework to expose the limitations of current regulatory approaches.¶ In an ideal world, regulations are designed to protect the public interest, but, in reality, special interests can sometimes dominate regulatory decisions – a phenomenon generally referred to as regulatory capture. While helpful in explaining why regulators may sometimes fail to adequately protect the public interest, this concept is too narrow to encompass broader forms of industry influence over all material aspects of pharmaceutical markets and their regulation.¶ Instead, I develop the concept of pharmaceutical capture to encompass the myriad of ways in which the largest corporate actors influence markets for prescription drugs, with the market for prescription opioids as a particularly salient example.¶ Pharmaceutical capture occurs when the magnitude and scope of corporate influence is significant enough to alter the incentive structures, and corresponding decisions, of a sufficient number of pharmaceutical industry stakeholders in ways that ensure that relevant markets yield the outcomes desired by the industry captors. Understanding how pharmaceutical capture occurs is an essential first step in improving the effectiveness of regulatory strategies in pharmaceutical markets.¶ Although recent court settlements with some of the largest manufacturers and distributors of opioids have resulted in industry payouts of as much as $26 billion, these payments pale in comparison to the profits reaped from opioid sales. More importantly, the court settlements do little to change the market conditions that allowed for the growth of opioid profits at the expense of public health. With the exception of Purdue, which is now in the midst of a bankruptcy reorganization, major manufacturers and distributers of opioids continue to operate in much the same fashion as they did before, with court settlements operating more like parking tickets than drivers of change. Indeed, some of the very companies that benefitted from opioid sales are now reaping profits from the sale of treatments for addiction. Even the addiction treatment industry now has its own share of problems arising from the increasing demand for, and profitability of, addiction treatment services.¶ I conclude that an effective regulatory response towards the opioid epidemic must be geared towards addressing, and curtailing, pharmaceutical capture. Drawing lessons from the sophisticated corporate strategies used to influence market design, I offer three guiding principles for regulatory redesign. The first is the need for a holistic, systemic approach to regulation to replace current fragmented approaches. The second is the need to recalibrate key underlying policy assumptions about pharmaceutical markets and their appropriate regulation. The third is the need to make regulation more robust to corporate interests through strategies that narrow the divergence of private interests from the public interest, make capture more costly, and/or provide greater resources and rewards for regulating in the public interest.

#### Patents created the opioid crisis – they reward companies that make addictive drugs and allow aggressive marketing which led to overprescribing
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Opioid overdoses killed an estimated 46,802 people in the US in 2018.1 That is a very slight decline from the previous year, but it is still a stunning number. To put that figure in perspective, more Americans now die from opioid over doses than from motor vehicle accidents2 or from the AIDS epidemic at its peak.3 Over one-third of US adults are estimated to have used prescription opioids in 2015, and nearly 5 percent to have misused them.4 The ubiquity of opioids not only put those patients who had prescriptions at risk of addiction but also unleashed a flood of pills that could be used and abused by family members and friends.5 Prescription opioids further fed into the spread of other opioids—including heroin, the use of which increased almost five - fold in a decade,6 and fentanyl, a synthetic opioid that has seen an even more dramatic and deadly surge.7 The economic costs of the epidemic are staggering, likely topping $500 billion annually.8 Without a doubt, the opioid crisis is among the primary policy challenges facing the US today. Two dominant narratives have emerged in scholarly and popular commentary on the opioid crisis's causes. One narrative casts opioid abuse as a 'disease of despair'-a by-product of poverty and lack of economic opportunity that has hit hardest in deindustrializing regions.9 This account may capture some important social trends, but identifying causal mechanisms behind the growth in opioid overdoses has proven challenging. '0 Econometric evidence suggests that overdoses have more to do with the availability and cost of drugs than with regional economic trends. As one prominent health economist recently wrote, 'efforts to improve local economies, while desirable for other reasons, are not likely to yield significant reductions in overdose mortality.'"¶ A second narrative-which we refer to as the 'disease of deception' account- emphasizes the role of pharmaceutical companies in hiding addiction risks from the public even as they aggressively marketed opioids for ever-broader uses. The chief antagonists in this narrative are members of the Sackler family that owned and ran Purdue Pharma, the maker of the now-infamous opioid drug OxyContin." The disease-of-deception narrative draws strong support from documents that have surfaced in litigation against Purdue Pharma revealing that company officials knew shortly after OxyContin's introduction in 1996 that the drug was being abused widely-yet concealed that information from the public."¶ Even Purdue Pharma's most withering critics do not allege that the company's cover-up was the sole cause of the opioid crisis, however. Widespread OxyContin abuse was a front-page news story as early as 2001 , when the opioid epidemic was still in its nascent stage. ' 4 '[N]o prescription drug in the last 20 years has been so widely abused so soon after its release as OxyContin,' the New York Times reported in May 200] , citing officials at the federal Drug Enforcement Administration (DF.A).'5 Talk radio host Rush Limbaugh drew greater attention to OxyContin in 2003 when he acknowledged on air that he had become addicted to prescription painkillers." And in 2007, a full decade before the annual death toll from opioid abuse reached its peak, Purdue Pharma and three of its executives entered a widely publicized guilty plea to federal criminal charges of misbranding charges related to the company's concealment of OxyContin's addictive properties. '7 None of this is to suggest that Purdue Pharma and other pharmaceutical companies that marketed prescription opioids are immune from blame for the current crisis. They are not. But deception alone cannot explain how opioids continued to inundate American medicine cabinets long after the addiction risks were widely publicized.¶ How did opioids overwhelm a nation well aware of their addictive properties, claiming victims across the socioeconomic spectrum? To understand that, one must understand not only how opioid manufacturers aggressively marketed their wares and why physicians profligately prescribed these drugs but also why alternative pain management strategies failed to emerge and why opioid antidotes and abuse treatments were so much slower to spread. Purdue Pharma and 'pill mills' play a part in this story," but so does Medicaid's 'best price' mandate and the National Institutes of Health's (N IH) allocation of research funding. Comprehending the origins and persistence of the crisis requires a deep dive into the organizations and policies that drove the opioid wave as well as those that failed to produce a robust response.¶ This article takes up that task. We suggest that the opioid epidemic is, in important respects, a disease of design. By this, we do not mean to suggest that the opioid crisis is the outgrowth of any single person's grand plan. What we mean instead is that the design of institutions created conditions that allowed the crisis to arise and proliferate. We focus in particular on the design of innovation institutions-the legal arrangements that structure the production and allocation of knowledge goods. '9 These include not only intellectual property law (patents, trade secrets, trademarks, regulatory exclusivity, etc.), but also the regulatory structures of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) that determine whether knowledge goods can reach the market and the public benefit programs like Medicare and Medicaid that subsidize access to knowledge goods."¶ The design of innovation institutions enabled the opioid epidemic in a number of ways. First, US innovation institutions produced powerful incentives for pharmaceutical firms to develop and commercialize highly addictive prescription pain medicines while imposing weaker constraints on the rollout of new and more addictive products. Second, systems for allocating access to medical technologies promoted the use of addictive medicines while creating barriers to access for addiction treatments. Third, innovation institutions allowed-and indeed, encouraged-manufacturers of opioid antidotes to charge sky-high prices for products that, if more widely accessible, likely could have saved the lives of thousands of opioid overdose victims. Fourth, even while encouraging the rapid diffusion of addictive opioids, innovation institutions failed to sufficiently reward firms for formulating, refining, or popularizing alternative treatments for addiction or for the underlying problem of chronic pain. Again, no one sat down and designed the system to work this way. But a series of institutional design choices-some conscious, others unconscious-allowed a perfect storm to coalesce.¶ Some of these design flaws are relatively familiar. Intellectual property (IP) is an innovation institution that relies on signals of social value generated by market mechanisms, and market-generated signals can yield inefficient allocations of goods in the presence of externalities. Addictive pain medications generate negative externalities, and overdose and addiction treatments produce positive externalities, so it is perhaps unsurprising that America ended up with too many addictive prescription opioids and too few overdose and addiction treatments. Furthermore, IP distorts investments in research and development toward patentable technologies like pharmaceuticals," so it is no surprise that the patent-centric US innovation institutions resulted in a nation awash in pills but wanting for alternative pain treatments.¶ In other respects, our examination of the role of innovation institutions in the opioid epidemic challenges traditional understandings of IP in particular, and innovation institutions more broadly. The conventional view posits that IP policy's fundamental trade-off is between innovation and access, or what economists call dynamic efficiency and allocative efficiency.22 IP incentivizes the development and commercialization of new and better products (the dynamic-efficiency benefit), but it also encourages IP holders to raise prices and restrict access (the allocative-inefficiency cost). The opioid epidemic presents a contrasting image of IP’s potential consumption-expanding effects. Opioid patents induced investments in efforts to create demand for products that consumers did not previously believe they wanted." This demand-creation effect was especially powerful because the patented product was habit-forming-Purdue's lower prices for OxyContin in the short term could thus raise consumption in the long term.24 And this problem was exacerbated by the effective cost often being lowered through prescription drug insurance. Although scholars typically view the increased use of patented technologies as a welfare gain, the example of prescription opioids illustrates that patents' consumption-expanding effects can be pernicious. ¶ Ideally, the government would counteract the biases embedded in the patent system through other innovation institutions, including regulations, taxes, and government directed financial rewards such as grants and prizes. For example, market-based prizes in the form of insurance reimbursement policies appear to be a particularly promising intervention.2S But in the context of pain treatment, the federal government's non-patent interventions exacerbated the skew toward prescription opioids and away from other pain management and mitigation strategies. At the same time, government policies created barriers that limited access to addiction treatments. Additionally, and paradoxically, the federal governments subsidies for opioid antidotes may have reduced access to these lifesaving products, challenging the view that demand-side subsidies are a solution to the patent system's pitfalls.¶ Recognizing the role of America's innovation institutions in the opioid epidemic helps inform the search for paths out of the current crisis, but it is essential to emphasize that no magic-bullet policy will bring the opioid epidemic to an end. The proliferation of prescription opioids was both a function of incentives generated by the current innovation ecosystem and a response-misguided as it may have been-to the very real problem of chronic pain afflicting an estimated one in five US adults." Any comprehensive effort to curtail opioid abuse will require interventions aimed at addressing chronic pain in ways that do not put patients at risk of addiction. The solution likely will involve regulated use of opioids by the populations for which they are justified as well as both existing and novel nonaddictive analgesics." At the same time, wider access to existing non-pharmacological pain treatments such as acupuncture, physical therapy, exercise, meditation, and cognitive behavioral therapy may do as much to mitigate the overuse of prescription opioids as any pharmacological leap." Moreover, any comprehensive national strategy to contain the opioid epidemic also will require interventions aimed at individuals already in the throes of addiction (medically known as 'substance use disorder' or 'opioid use disorder').29 Initiatives at the federal, state, and local levels suggest progress in this regard, though still on a scale far too small relative to the problem that they aim to solve.30¶ This article is an attempt to understand how innovation institutions are bound up in the opioid crisis, how they might help to bring the crisis to an end, and what lessons the opioid crisis offers for innovation policy going forward. Part II investigates the relationship between innovation institutions and the sky-high rates of opioid use, abuse, and overdose. Part 111 draws on insights from the study of innovation policy and comparative institutional analysis to evaluate the ways in which innovation institutions can respond to the opioid epidemic. For example, distortions caused by patent law might be addressed through interventions in areas such as FDA regulation, tort law, and antitrust. And direct public support can address problems on both the incentive and allocation side of innovation policy. As we discuss, there are significant political hurdles to reform, although it is at least promising that opioid misuse is now being viewed as a public health problem. Finally, Part IV asks what lessons we can learn from the opioid crisis for innovation policy more broadly.

#### Our current IP system devastates public health, it creates all the wrong incentives.
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While our primary focus in this article is on the ways in which America's innovation institutions have contributed to the opioid crisis and can hasten its end, the opioid epidemic also yields lessons for innovation scholars that apply to other areas of public health and scientific knowledge.¶ The stories of OxyContin, Suboxone, and Evzio confirm some truths that we have long known about the IP system. IP is an effective innovation incentive for aggregating dispersed information about consumers' willingness to pay for new knowledge goods-but when markets fail, so too will IP. Two familiar reasons why markets fail to produce socially optimal outcomes are (1) the externalization of harms and (2) the externalization of benefits. OxyContin is an example of a product that generates negative externalities, and-unsurprisingly-we ended up with too much OxyContin. Suboxone and Evzio are examples of products that generate positive externalities, and-unsurprisingly-we have ended up with too little of these drugs. ¶ America's apparent underinvestment in non-pharmacological pain treatments likewise fits into our existing mental models. Non-pharmacological pain treatments such as yoga and acupuncture are almost inevitably nonexcludable and ineligible for patent protection. Our innovation ecosystem is well designed to reward patentable technologies, such as pharmaceuticals, and poorly structured to support the development of processes and practices such as checklists, cognitive behavioral therapy, and alternative medicine317¶ Yet in other ways, our study of the opioid crisis has challenged our beliefs about innovation policy and led us toward new insights. In this final part, we highlight five lessons from the opioid context for innovation policy more broadly: ¶ First, we think that the traditional view of IP as a trade-off between dynamic efficiency and allocative efficiency is less accurate than we once believed.3'8 In the case of OxyContin, patent protection appears to have encouraged Purdue Pharma's extraordinary investment in demand creation. Aggregate data on the consumption of patented and post-patent pharmaceuticals suggest that the OxyContin story is not an outlier in this regard.3 '9 Especially when a pharmaceutical manufacturer follows a relatively standard pricing strategy (such that the product is available to Medicaid and Medicare beneficiaries and is included in most private health plan formularies), above- marginal-cost pricing seems less likely to prevent the vast majority of US patients from gaining access than conventional IP models suggest.¶ Second, and relatedly, the fact that IP encourages demand creation should affect our view of IP's overall welfare effects. Do we want to encourage patentees to create demand for products for which demand does not currently exist? There are, perhaps, cases in which the answer is yes-for example, Eli Lilly's promotion of Prozac arguably generated greater attention toward untreated depression.32Â° But we should be aware that the patent system creates incentives for firms to promote products that consumers did not know they wanted (and indeed might not have needed).321¶ Third, the interaction between IP and addiction can be particularly pernicious. As we sought to illustrate in Section ll.B.l, firms have an especially strong incentive to promote habit-forming products-perhaps by initially charging below-marginal-cost prices-if they anticipate that they can maintain a medium- to long-term monopoly over that product. When the habit-forming nature of a product generates negative externalities, as is the case for medical addiction, the combination of this effect with the more general demand-creation incentives can have devastating social consequences. It is possible that this misalignment of IP rewards with social welfare could be addressed by reforms internal to IP. For example, Michael Risch has called for a revitalization of patent law's utility requirement to deny patents on inventions from which society reaps no benefit (even if the innovator can reap significant profits).322 Margo Bagley has suggested legislative restrictions on patentable subject matter to revive moral utility doctrine and move away from the US's current (and distinctively American) 'patent first, ask questions later' approach. As another example, Ted Sichelman suggests that patent law remedies should be reformed to better reflect the social value, not market value, of an invention.32" But, non-LP innovation institutions also have an important- and perhaps paramount-role to play in correcting the 11' systems biases.325 ¶ A fourth lesson from the opioid crisis for other areas of innovation policy is that the notion that government subsidies can promote access to IP-protected products turns out to be less than clear-cut. Medicaid's best-price mandate incentivizes pharmaceutical firms to charge higher prices to the private sector, and as the number of patients covered by Medicaid increases, so too does the incentive for firms to set private sector prices with Medicaid in mind. This is not an argument against Medicaid expansion, and removing the best-price mandate without creating an alternative means to control government drug spending would lead to different (and perhaps worse) pathologies. But, it does suggest that government subsidies should be designed with attention to their impact on private pharmaceutical pricing. ¶ Indeed, in a world without Medicaid's best-price mandate or other limits on incentives to offer discounts to some purchasers, pharmaceutical firms might seek to maximize profits through price discrimination (ie seeking to ensure that every consumer who values a product at more than its marginal cost will be charged her willingness to pay and no more). Perfect price discrimination entails no deadweight loss. Medicaid changes the incentive to engage in price discrimination, however, because the lowest price charged to other purchasers becomes the ceiling for Medicaid reimbursement. The limit on charging CMS more than the 'usual and customary charges to the general public' has a similar effect.326 In such cases, IP does lead to serious allocative inefficiencies, but the inefficiencies are because of the way IP interacts with other government policies. To be sure, perfect price discrimination will almost never be possible, and deadweight loss in the IP system is inevitable. But the opioid crisis illustrates that subsidies can do as much to increase deadweight loss as to reduce it.¶ Finally, and notwithstanding our criticisms of the IP system, we again emphasize that non-IP innovation incentives and allocation mechanisms are imperfect. ln the case of the opioid epidemic, CMS created powerful non-IP incentives for hospitals to prescribe more opioids.327 That turned out to be a disaster. The root causes of this particular policy failure are unclear, but we should be cognizant in our critique of certain aspects of market-based IP policies that the grass is not always greener on the non-market side.

#### The plan spurs on innovation for non-opioid pain killers
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Conventionally, innovation scholars have focused on patent law as the main policy tool to increase production of new knowledge goods.226 Patents, at least in theory, leverage private information from market actors about the value and viability of potential projects and provide strong incentives for investments in promising ideas.227 But as emphasized in Section ll.B, these same features of the patent system encouraged the development and commercialization of prescription opioids. Given the patent system's pro-pharmaceutical skew-and, in particular, its bias toward addictive goods-one natural response might be to write all patents as a potential solution to a problem that, in many respects, is a product of too many pills.¶ We think that would be a mistake. As awareness grows among physicians and patients about the addiction risk associated with prescription opioids, demand for nonaddictive pain treatments will increase too. The patent system will generate strong financial incentives for pharmaceutical and biotech firms to invest in the development of non-opioid painlkillers,228 abuse-resistant opioids,'229 drugs that can be used to 230 and easier delivery methods for the overdose antidote naloxone.23' treat addiction, (Indeed, many firms already have.232) There is, to be sure, something unseemly about the very firms that fueled the spread of prescription opioids also profiting from the problem they helped create. Many Americans were thus understandably outraged to learn that Purdue Pharma has filed for a patent on a drug that could 'help wean addicts from opioids,' given that Purdue had helped to hook some of those same people on opioids in the first place.233 It would be an even crueler irony, though, if the patent system failed to reward investments in innovations that could bring the opioid epidemic under control and thereby encouraged the proliferation of prescription opioids but not the development of solutions to addiction.¶ Of course, these powerful patent incentives still may be subject to the same distortions described in Part 11. Patents also skew research toward treatments that require repeated use-and thus generate steady streams of revenue-rather than preventatives which are effective after a single administration.7"l'4 Patent law may therefore be more helpful, for example, in encouraging the development of nonaddictive painkillers than in the development of anti-addiction vaccines.235 Patent law likewise will do little to facilitate research and development directed at ideas that are difficult for a single firm to commodify—for example, reducing the default number of pills per prescription,236 informing doctors when their patients overdose,237 or encouraging the use of alternative pain treatments such as physical or behavioral therapy.238 Patents are also ineffective incentives for non-pharmaceutical addiction recovery tools such as mobile phone reminders that track the number of days that a patient has remained substance-free,239 for creative ideas like using reverse motion detectors in clinic bathrooms (ie devices that detect lack of motion) to prevent fatal overdoses,240 and for research on the comparative value of supervised drug use clinics241 or different drug court protocols or streamlined ER-to-outpatient transfers for preventing relapse.242¶ Episodes such as Indivior’s effort to undermine the tablet form of Suboxone243 highlight the need to consider broad changes to patent law and its interactions with FDA regulatory law, antitrust law, tort law, and other institutions that might cabin its pathologies.244 These changes, however, may take years to formulate and implement. In the meantime, the opioid epidemic’s daily death toll reminds us of ‘the fierce urgency of now.’245 While patents may play a role in promoting the development and commercialization of opioid alternatives, antidotes, and addiction treatments, we think it is clear enough that America will not patent its way out of the opioid crisis. Policymakers will need to look elsewhere for solutions.

#### Reject Negative Turns – they’re pharmaceutical lies – the Plan isn’t anti-Patent – breaking down secondary patents is key.

* AT Advantage CPs to solve Drug Prices

Radhakrishnan 16 Priti Radhakrishnan 6-14-2016 "Pharma’s secret weapon to keep drug prices high" <https://www.statnews.com/2016/06/14/secondary-patent-gilead-sovaldi-harvoni/> (Priti Radhakrishnan is cofounder and director of the Initiative for Medicines, Access & Knowledge (I-MAK), a US-based nonprofit group of scientists and lawyers working globally to get people lifesaving medicines. Before founding I-MAK, she worked as a health attorney in the US, Switzerland, and India.)//Elmer

Skyrocketing drug prices are forcing states to take **unprecedented measures** to rein in health care spending. Vermont just became the nation’s first state to require prescription drug pricing transparency. The New York and Massachusetts attorneys general have launched investigations into major pharmaceutical companies’ and insurers’ drug pricing policies and strategies. These **are important steps**. **But** they **ignore a key driver of the problem: secondary patents**. Familiar to only a few people inside the insular world of intellectual property law, secondary patents work like this: Companies file for additional, defensive patents to thicken the protection around their original base patents. These additional patents **rarely represent anything new in terms of science**. Instead, their **purpose is to** **prolong** **a** company’s **monopoly** and, along with that, its ability to charge high prices for its drugs. Some drugs have dozens of secondary patents. Abbott Labs, for example, has over 108 patents on its HIV drug Kaletra. Take the case of Sovaldi, a treatment for hepatitis C developed by Gilead Sciences. In the United States, Gilead prices Sovaldi at up to $1,000 a pill, or about $84,000 for a complete course of treatment. This pricing strategy helped Gilead clear $18 billion in profits last year, while taxpayer-funded Medicaid programs, state health programs, and patients have trouble affording this astronomically priced drug. Sovaldi is comprised of a base compound — sofosbuvir — for which the pharma giant has filed three patents. On top of that, Gilead has pursued an additional 24 patents, with more likely to come. My organization, the Initiative for Medicines, Access & Knowledge (I-MAK), aims to ensure that people with hepatitis C and HIV around the world get the medicines they need to survive and lead healthy lives. We have evaluated Gilead’s patent portfolio and found that, based on US and international patent law, Gilead does not deserve any of its 27 patents for Sovaldi. Both the base and secondary patents for the drug are based on old science and commonly known techniques. Yet because of its defensive patenting strategy, Gilead will maintain an iron lock on its market share and charge exorbitantly high prices to Americans with hepatitis C until well into the 2030s. Harvoni, another medication that treats hepatitis C, combines sofosbuvir and a drug called ledipasvir. Currently, Harvoni has 27 secondary patents. If these were removed, people in the US could access far cheaper versions of the same drug as soon as 10 years earlier. Based on I-MAK’s conservative estimates, this could open access to treatment for millions of people in the US, saving patients and payers like Medicare and Medicaid $5 billion over an eight-year period. In the US, Harvoni is priced at $94,000 for a course of treatment. In middle-income, high-population countries like Argentina, Brazil, and China, people are forced to pay thousands of dollars for sofosbuvir. Stripping away unmerited patents would reduce drug costs and increase access for millions of people in the US and around the world. **Pharmaceutical companies love to claim that winnowing** their armada of **patents would be a disincentive to innovation** and would limit research into new drugs. **Don’t believe it**. **The industry devotes shockingly little funding to research and development**. Companies **spend** roughly **one-third** of their revenues **on marketing** **and only half as much on research** and development, while spending big on armies of lawyers to devise and defend secondary patents and other so-called “life cycle management” strategies. Drug **research funding** has been **declining for more than a decade**, **while** strategies of **secondary patenting have steadily increased.** We support patents — just not those that are unmerited and that unjustly prolong companies’ market power and prevent legitimate competition.

### 1AC – Plan Text

#### Plan Text: The Member Nations of the World Trade Organization ought to terminate current and ban secondary patents for all medicines

TAF 20 [The Arnold Foundation “'Evergreening' Stunts Competition, Costs Consumers and Taxpayers” Published: September 24, 2020] [https://www.arnoldventures.org/stories/evergreening-stunts-competition-costs-consumers-and-taxpayers/] [TAF: Philanthropy dedicated to tackling problems in the US. Team of more than 90 subject matter experts in Houston, with offices in New York and DC.]

As the Evergreen Drug Patent Search makes clear, the positive impact of Hatch-Waxman has been steadily and severely eroded by a regulatory system vulnerable to increasingly sophisticated forms of manipulation. “You might say that the patent and regulatory system has been weaponized,” Feldman said. “When billions of dollars are at stake, there’s a lot of money available to look for ways to exploit the legal system. And companies have become adept at this, as our work has found.” There are several key steps that Congress could take to restore the balance between innovation and competition that is the key to a successful prescription drug regulatory process. These may include: Imposing restrictions on the number of patents that prescription drug manufacturers can defend in court to discourage the use of anticompetitive patent thickets. Limiting the patentability of so-called secondary patents — which don’t improve the safety or efficacy of a drug — through patent and exclusivity reform. Reforming the 180-day generic exclusivity, which can currently be abused to block other competitive therapies. “The Evergreen Drug Patent Search provides the publicly available, evidence-based foundation that defines the extent of the problem, and it can be used to develop policies that solve the problem of anti-competitive patent abuses,” said Kristi Martin, VP of Drug Pricing at Arnold Ventures. “Our incentives have gotten out of whack,” Martin said. “The luxury of monopoly protection should only be provided to innovations that provide meaningful benefits in saving lives, curing illnesses, or improving the quality of people’s lives. It should not be provided to those gaming the system. If we can change that, we can save consumers, employers, and taxpayers many billions of dollars while increasing the incentives for pharmaceutical companies to achieve breakthroughs."

#### The plan is key – Other strategies can’t solve patent abuse
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The US opioid epidemic seems to many to have come out of nowhere, and there’s been much finger-pointing in recent years about how this state of affairs came to be. Some have argued that inadequate mental healthcare is to blame. Others have postulated that doctors were naively over prescribing them as a way to quickly treat pain and please their patients. But, according to a recently published draft report, at least some of the blame should be attributed to the way pharmaceutical companies have manipulated patent extensions over the past decade.¶ In the 1970s and 80s, doctors were looking for better ways to control pain, and many believed opioids a good, non-addictive option. In the 1990s, drug manufacturers began aggressively marketing the painkillers to doctors and patients. Soon, patients (or their loved ones who stole their pills) were developing tolerances for low doses, and graduated to abusing the drugs by crushing them and either snorting or liquefying and injecting the powders, or turning to heroin, often fatally. By the time the science caught up in the early 2000s, it was too late: Thousands of people were addicted to opioids. Opioids have killed over 560,000 people in the US since 2000. Last month, president Donald Trump declared the crisis a public health emergency.¶ Pharmaceutical companies profited from this demand, and the exclusive rights they had to make these compounds. This allowed them to pump even more money into marketing, which inevitably led to doctors prescribing more of them.¶ From the moment a drug company patents a compound, it has 20 years of exclusive manufacturing and selling rights on it. In theory, a company’s monopoly on a drug dissolves after its patents expire and generics flood the market. But drug companies usually file for patents in the discovery stages as a way of staking their territory in the field. The approval process for drugs from the US Food and Drug Administration involves lengthy clinical trials, which usually take around 12 years—meaning that manufacturers typically only get to actually sell their drugs exclusively for about eight years before generics come onto the market. So they often seek ways to extend this exclusive period.¶ Perhaps the most common way is to change a drug ever so slightly. For example, a company can file a new patent if it makes a version of a drug with a slightly different dosage, or with a different way it’s released in the body over time.¶ “Our patent system doesn’t require something to be better, just different,” says Robin Feldman, the director of the Institute for Innovation Law at the University of California Hastings College of Law. “Rather than creating new medicines, pharmaceutical companies are largely recycling and repurposing [drugs].” The manufacturer can then hold off generic competition for a few more years. Competitors (or anyone else) could theoretically make the case in court that these compounds aren’t actually different, but the legal battle would likely be too costly and time consuming to be worth it.¶ Feldman, together with Connie Wang, a law student at Stanford University, meticulously went through a decade’s worth of versions of the US Food and Drug Administration’s “Orange Book” and US Patent and Trademark Office website listings to investigate the relationship between patent filings, exclusivity extensions, and drug approvals. They found that of the 100 best-selling drugs from 2005 to 2015, about 80% had a patent extension filed on them at least once. About 50% of these drugs had multiple extensions.¶ That, Feldman argues, can create a dangerous cycle. “The immense monopoly profits allow drug companies like Purdue to aggressively market their drugs to doctors,” explains Feldman. “Physicians preferentially prescribe these particular drugs. Where drugs are addictive and problematic, that’s dangerous.”¶ Purdue Pharma is the company behind one of the most popular prescription opioids. OxyContin first came on the market in 1996 and has since brought in billions of dollars of revenue. Purdue’s patent for OxyContin was originally supposed to expire in 2013. But by making minor tweaks to the drug’s chemical structure to create a slow-release pill the company markets as “abuse-proof,” Purdue has been able to file new patents for OxyContin 13 times with the US Patent and Trademark Office over the past decade, thereby extending its exclusive selling rights on the drug through 2030.¶ Purdue did not respond directly to Feldman’s analysis when forwarded a copy by Quartz, instead providing a statement noting, “One potentially important step towards the goal of creating safer opioid analgesics has been the development of opioids that are formulated to deter abuse. FDA considers the development of these products a high public health priority. Purdue reformulated OxyContin with abuse-deterrent properties recognized by FDA, and the Patent and Trademark Office granted Purdue patents for inventions that went into the development of those properties.”¶ The most prominent example is a patent Purdue filed in 2003 for “abuse-proof” OxyContin. It was made of materials that are harder to crush, and forms a gel that is more viscous and harder to inject. In theory, it would make for a safer alternative to regular OxyContin. However, the same patent claims that “intravenous administration of such a gel would most probably result in obstruction of blood vessels, associated with serious embolism or even death of the abuser.” In all likelihood, people crushing these pills to get high would still seriously harm, if not kill, themselves.¶ Technically, the abuse-proof pills worked: When researchers from Washington University in St. Louis informally surveyed more than 2,500 people taking opioids to see if this pill really was more abuse-proof than before, they found that the number of people who admitted to using it to get high dropped from about 35% to about 13% two years later. However, two thirds of respondents said they had switched to other opioids instead—often heroin, which is less expensive and easy to use.¶ It’s not Purdue’s fault doctors kept prescribing (and overprescribing) these pills in an attempt to alleviate pain, nor that the loved ones of patients often took instead to get high. It’s also not the company’s fault there weren’t better resources for those who found themselves addicted—drugs like buprenorphine, methadone and naltrexone can help ease addiction, but as recently as 2016, they still weren’t being given to patients in two-thirds of US addiction clinics.¶ That said, Purdue spent many years and huge sums of money convincing doctors that OxyContin was non addictive. In fact, the company has paid over $600 million in fines to federal and state agencies, as well as individual patients, to settle claims that it falsely marketed OxyContin as safe from abuse. Three of the company’s executives pled guilty to “misbranding,” which is a criminal violation.¶ The company is still profiting off “abuse-deterrent” OxyContin. Though there are currently “authorized generics” of OxyContin available, these are made by manufacturers with licenses to use Purdue’s formula. In other words, Purdue makes money off them. And there are currently no approved abuse-deterrent generics in the US. In September of this year, FDA commissioner Scott Gottlieb said that soon the agency plans to issue guidelines to assist companies who are trying to file applications for these types of generics. No word on when that document will be published, however.

## 1AC – Framing

### Fwk – Soft Left

#### The Standard is maximizing expected wellbeing:

#### 1] Humans are hard-coded to follow pleasure and pain, comes before other ethics

Berridge et al 13 [Kent C Berridge, Morten L Kringelbach “*Neuroscience of affect: brain mechanisms of pleasure and displeasure*” Published: Current Opinion in Neurobiology, Vol. 23, Issue 3, June 2013] [<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2013.01.017>; Pg. 298-300] [PDF available upon request] [Berridge: James Olds Distinguished University Professor of Psychology and Neuroscience at University of Michigan. Ph.D. University of Pennsylvania] [Kringelbach: Professor of Neuroscience, Aarhus University. Senior Research Fellow, The Queen's College.] || SM

Subcortical brain machinery for actually generating or causing a ‘liking’ reaction to core pleasure can be probed more extensively via brain manipulations in animals. Studies in our laboratory have identified neural pleasure generators by focusing on the sensory pleasure of sweetness. Sweet ‘liking’ is useful because affective facial expressions of taste pleasure ‘liking’ exist in newborn humans and in some animals, aiding the objective measure of hedonic impact. For example, parents often know when their baby expresses a ‘liking’ judgment of the deliciousness of a meal. Sweet foods elicit a contented licking of the lips, but bitter tastes instead elicit disgust gapes and headshakes. Homologous ‘liking’ orofacial expressions are elicited also in apes and monkeys, and even in rats and mice [47]. We have used brain manipulations of ‘liking’ reactions to identify brain mechanisms that generate and enhance such pleasures as sweetness (Figure 3).

One surprising finding has been that neural generators of intense pleasure are much more restricted neurochemically than was previously envisioned. For instance, mesolimbic dopamine, probably the most popular brain neurotransmitter candidate for pleasure two decades ago, turns out not to cause pleasure or ‘liking’ at all. Rather dopamine more selectively mediates a motivational process of incentive salience, which is a mechanism for ‘wanting’ rewards but not for ‘liking’ them. When amplified by addictive drugs or by endogenous factors, dopamine helps generate intense levels of ‘wanting’, characteristic of drug addiction, eating disorders, and related compulsive pursuits. Why, then, are dopamine-promoting drugs such as cocaine or methamphetamine reportedly so pleasant? One possibility is that some psychostimulant euphoria comes from the ‘wanting’ component of reward: a world that seems more attractive may well carry an aura of euphoria. Another potential mechanism is that, distinct from raising dopamine in the synapse, such drugs might also induce secondary recruitment of additional neurobiological mechanisms that more directly cause hedonic pleasure. For instance, there is evidence to suggest that elevation of endogenous opioid signals may be recruited in limbic structure [62,63]. Such opioid recruitment in accumbens-pallidal hotspots described below would plausibly generate pleasure ‘liking’ [64]. Conceivably, the secondary recruitment of hedonic mechanisms might become somewhat sluggish with continual drug-taking, therefore requiring higher doses for the sought-after pleasurable high, even if dopamine-related sensitization enhanced circuit reactivity to produce more and more intense ‘wanting’ [60].

Hedonic hotspot network

Another surprising finding has been that pleasures generators are much more anatomically restricted than previously envisioned, localized to particular subregions. We have identified several pleasure generators as small hedonic hotspots, nestled in subcortical structures. Opioid and endocannabinoid neurochemical signals do more effectively generate intense pleasures than dopamine — but only within the boundaries of such hotspots. For example, mu opioid stimulation by DAMGO microinjection within a hotspot of NAc (localized in the rostrodorsal quadrant of medial shell), or in another hotspot of ventral pallidum (in the posterior half of ventral pallidum), more than doubles the intensity of ‘liking’ reactions elicited by sweetness. But the same DAMGO microinjections elsewhere in the remaining 90% of NAc outside the hotspot generate only ‘wanting’ without enhancing ‘liking’ — much like dopamine (i.e. remaining 60% of medial shell and probably entire lateral shell and core; and even regions of dorsal striatum) (Figures 1 and 3). In addition, in the anterior half of ventral pallidum, DAMGO microinjection actually causes opposite suppression of ‘liking’ reactions. So far, no hedonic hotspots have yet been found in neocortex (though the search continues), but rather only in these subcortical structures. Continued failure to find a hedonic-enhancing hotspot in prefrontal cortex would be another reason to distinguish between cortical representation and subcortical causation of pleasure as different functions.

Each accumbens-pallidum hotspot is only a cubic-millimeter in volume in rats (a human hotspot equivalent hould be approximately a cubic-centimeter, if scaled to whole-brain size). Functionally, hedonic hotspots seem quite specialized for intense pleasure generation compared to regions around them. Neurobiologically, hotspots may have unique anatomical or neurobiological features that distinguish them from the rest of their containing structure, and which perhaps permit the functional specialization for pleasure causation (Figure 1).

Integrating neurochemical and anatomical findings, what makes opioid neurotransmitters more hedonic than dopamine is not that limbic opioid signals always generate ‘liking’. In most of NAc, neither does. Rather opioid stimulation has the special capacity to enhance ‘liking’ only if the stimulation occurs within an anatomical hotspot— whereas dopamine never does anywhere. Beyond NAc and ventral pallidum, opioid stimulation in all regions tested so far for other structures, such as neostriatum, amygdala, and so on, at best generate enhancement only of motivation ‘wanting’ without enhancing hedonic ‘liking’. Overall, the pattern indicates not only strong localization of hedonic function, but also neurochemical specificity of pleasure neurotransmitters.

Functionally, hotspots in NAc and ventral pallidum interact together in a single integrated circuit. The two sites act as a functional unit for mediating pleasure enhancements. Each hotspot seems able to recruit the other to unanimously generate amplification of ‘liking’. For example, a single opioid microinjection into the NAc hotspot enhances also responsiveness of ventral pallidum hotspot neurons, reflected in neuronal firing patterns elicited by a sweet taste or in gene activation, at the same time as enhancing behavioral ‘liking’ reactions. Unanimous recruitment of both hotspots further appears to be required to magnify pleasure. Blocking either hotspot with an opioid-antagonist microinjection completely prevents opioid stimulation of the other hotspot from producing any ‘liking’ enhancement [72].Finally, the ventral pallidum hotspot may be especially important for maintaining normal levels of pleasure. Damage to ventral pallidum can cause even sweet sucrose taste to elicit purely negative gapes and other disgust reactions for days or weeks afterwards (C-Y Ho, ‘The ventral pallidum as a limbic pleasure generator, PhD Dissertation, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, 2010) [8,73]. No other brain lesion of a single site so potently transforms sensory pleasure into purely negative affect. Of course, other brain structures do help generate intense aversive emotions when manipulated in other ways

#### 2] “Scenario” based probability calculus is logically bankrupt and misunderstands IR. Prefer small, probable impacts

Kanwisher 89 [Nancy Kanwisher “*Cognitive Heuristics and American Security Policy*” Published: The Journal of Conflict Resolution, December 1989, Vol. 33, No. 4] [https://www.jstor.org/stable/173995; pp. 654–656] [PDF available upon request] [Kanwisher: Professor of Cognitive Neuroscience at MIT. Ex-faculty member at UCLA and Harvard. 1999 received the National Academy of Sciences Troland Research Award. Elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 2005 and to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 2009.] || SM

In a study of heuristics used in probability judgments, Tversky and Kahneman asked the participants of the 1982 Second International Congress on Forecasting to evaluate hypothetical scenarios (Tversky and Kahneman, 1983). All participants were professional forecasters and planners, and many had used scenarios in their work. One group evaluated the probability of "a complete suspension of diplomatic relations between the USA and the Soviet Union, sometime in 1983"; the other group judged the probability of "a Russian invasion of Poland, and a complete suspension of diplomatic relations between the USA and the Soviet Union, sometime in 1983."

The suspension-and-invasion scenario was judged to be much more probable than the suspension-only scenario, even though the latter event is a strict subset of the former. Tversky and Kahneman call this the "conjunction fallacy," because the conjunction of two events is judged more likely than one of them, even though this is a logical impossibility. People's probability judgments seem to follow their impressions of the plausibility of different scenarios: They find the suspension-and-invasion scenario more "representative," or typical, of superpower behavior than the suspension-alone scenario, which may seem inexplicable and hence not representative. This fallible evaluation method is an example of what Tversky and Kahneman call the "representativeness heuristic."

Thus, intuition tells us that the more detailed a scenario is, the more probable it is. Logically, however, the exact opposite is true. Tversky and Kahneman conclude that

scenarios can usefully serve to stimulate the imagination.... However, the use of scenarios as a prime instrument for the assessment of probabilities can be highly misleading. . A detailed scenario consisting of causally linked and representative events may appear more probable than a subset of these events. This effect contributes to the appeal of scenarios and to the illusory insight that they often provide [Tversky and Kahneman, 1983: 308].

Consideration of particular war-fighting scenarios has long played a key role in strategic analysis. Herman Kahn, who developed a complex taxonomy of different possible war-fighting scenarios, argued that scenarios "serve to call attention, sometimes dramatically and persuasively, to the large range of possibilities that must be considered in strategic analysis, some of which may escape notice if an analysis is done using conventional analytic techniques" (Kahn, 1962: 144). But while Kahn correctly recommends that the scenario not be used as a "predictive device," his position reflects some psychological naivete. People find causal sequences highly compelling and will often judge a representative scenario to be more likely than any of its component events. Thus, even if the purpose of developing scenarios is not to make or influence probability judgments, this may be the unintended consequence.

In fact, there is evidence that strategic priorities have in the past become distorted by overemphasizing the most extreme scenarios at the expense of less flashy but more likely ones. In 1960, although 90% of RAND studies used a bolt-out-of-the-blue surprise attack as a starting point, Herman Kahn and Tom Schelling polled their RAND colleagues and found that this was considered the least likely scenario (Herken, 1985: 205). Overemphasis on first-strike scenarios is not restricted to Hawks. Rathjens and Reed (1986) point out that while the most important arguments that Doves raised against the MX missile were that it was unnecessary and expensive, "it was most effectively opposed, however, by calling attention to its threatening characteristics as a first-strike weapon and its attractiveness as a target for a first-strike by the Soviet Union" (1986: 45). But, they contend, such arguments are unrealistic and lead to a distortion in perceptions of what are the most likely scenarios for the initiation of conflict.

Thus, while scenarios may be helpful in some respects, they may distort the focus of both strategic analysis and arms control. If scenarios must be used, one way to guard against biased probability estimates might be to estimate the probability of independent components in the causal sequence and multiply them together to estimate the overall probability of the overall scenario. Unfortunately, using confidence intervals may not be very helpful, because of the strong tendency for experts to be overconfident of their estimates (Lichtenstein, Fischoff, and Phillips, 1982). At the very least, however, strategic analysts should carefully consider the consequences of providing the defense community with esoteric but deceptively compelling stories about nuclear war.

It might be argued that biases in the subjective probabilities of scenarios do not matter because in "worst-case planning" probability is irrelevant; one simply prepares for the worst case - no matter how improbable - and assumes this preparation will suffice for less drastic scenarios. Two things are wrong with this argument. First, preparations for a worst-case scenario may make other undesirable events more probable. For example, preparing for what to do if deterrence fails may well increase the probability that it will in fact fail. As Les Aspin, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said recently on the issue of MX vulnerability to surprise attack, "the chances for a true, bolt-from-the-blue surprise attack are extremely small. But even in times of crisis, our political leaders may choose not to put our nuclear forces on wartime alert for fear of triggering a nuclear shoot-out" (reported in New York Times, March 24, 1989: A 9). Thus, the overall utility of preparing for the worst case cannot be determined without assessing how such preparations affect the likelihood of that worst case and of other scenarios. Second, since the domain of possible scenarios (and the range of attributes used to characterize those scenarios) is unbounded, it is impossible to define the worst case.3 The only way to salvage the idea is to reintroduce the role of probability and deal with "worst plausible cases." But once scenario probability assessment became necessary again, the problem of psychological distortions would resurface.

#### 3] Extinction first logic causes freezing – there’s always a risk of extinction which makes action impossible since any action neglects another existential risk.

#### 4] Slow violence is invisible and exponential – prefer it over flashpoint explanations of violence

Nixon 11 (Rob, Rachel Carson Professor of English, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor, pgs. 2-3)

Three primary concerns animate this book, chief among them my conviction that we urgently need to rethink-politically, imaginatively, and theoretically-what I call "slow violence." By slow violence I mean a violence that occurs gradually and out of sight, a violence of delayed destruction that is dispersed across time and space, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all. Violence is customarily conceived as an event or action that is immediate in time, explosive and spectacular in space, and as erupting into instant sensational visibility. We need, I believe, to engage a different kind of violence, a violence that is neither spectacular nor instantaneous, but rather incremental and accretive, its calamitous repercussions playing out across a range of temporal scales. In so doing, we also need to engage the representational, narrative, and strategic challenges posed by the relative invisibility of slow violence. Climate change, the thawing cryosphere, toxic drift, biomagnification, deforestation, the radioactive aftermaths of wars, acidifying oceans, and a host of other slowly unfolding environmental catastrophes present formidable representational obstacles that can hinder our efforts to mobilize and act decisively. The long dyings-the staggered and staggeringly discounted casualties, both human and ecological that result from war's toxic aftermaths or climate change-are underrepresented in strategic planning as well as in human memory. Had Summers advocated invading Africa with weapons of mass destruction, his proposal would have fallen under conventional definitions of violence and been perceived as a military or even an imperial invasion. Advocating invading countries with mass forms of slow-motion toxicity, however, requires rethinking our accepted assumptions of violence to include slow violence. Such a rethinking requires that we complicate conventional assumptions about violence as a highly visible act that is newsworthy because it is event focused, time bound, and body bound. We need to account for how the temporal dispersion of slow violence affects the way we perceive and respond to a variety of social afflictions-from domestic abuse to posttraumatic stress and, in particular, environmental calamities. A major challenge is representational: how to devise arresting stories, images, and symbols adequate to the pervasive but elusive violence of delayed effects. Crucially, slow violence is often not just attritional but also exponential, operating as a major threat multiplier; it can fuel long-term, proliferating conflicts in situations where the conditions for sustaining life become increasingly but gradually degraded.

#### 5] We can’t predict extinction impacts

Matheson 15 (Calum Matheson – This is his PhD dissertation at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, “Desired Ground Zeros: Nuclear Imagination and the Death Drive”, https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/indexablecontent/uuid:4bbcb13b-0b5f-43a1-884c-fcd6e6411fd6, pgs. 77 – 86,)

Herman Kahn and Bernard Brodie, perhaps the most prominent American strategists of the early Cold War, tried to make nuclear war “thinkable” in the sense that they tried to explain how such a war might start and what options would exist for national leaders. At the same time, both acknowledged that the outcome of a full-scale nuclear war was indescribable. In Brodie’s words, to “make an intellectual prediction of the likelihood of war is one thing, to project oneself imaginatively and seriously into an expected war situation is quite another” (Ghamari-Tabrizi 149). The unwillingness or inability to think “seriously” about a nuclear war—in other words, to understand it instrumentally rather than through dislocating language of the sublime—was met by organizations like the RAND Corporation with an attempt to systematize nuclear strategy and develop the intellectual and technical means to actually fight and control a nuclear war. Before RAND exercised its power through the “Whiz Kids” of the Kennedy Administration, the Strategic Air Command’s “Sunday punch” nuclear plan, enshrined in SIOP-62, was an all-out nuclear attack on the USSR, Eastern Europe, and the People’s Republic of China. It might have killed 285 million people in the initial attack (Kaplan 269). Despite its intricate planning and detailed execution strategies, SIOP was immensely inflexible. Asked whether the U.S. had any options to attack without striking China, which might not even be a combatant in the war, General Thomas Power replied “Well yeh [sic], we could do that, but I hope nobody thinks of it because it would really screw up the plan” (Kaplan 270, emphasis in original). Starting in the 1960s, a set of war games of various complexity was developed to test a broader range of nuclear theories and attack options at RAND and elsewhere (Arbella 35). Games like them continue to be used for strategic military planning today (Raatz). Most of these games—or at least their results—are classified, as they became the basis for US nuclear plans. In politicomilitary games, a number of military officers, civilians, and generally mid- to lowranking government officials would play various roles as US and/or foreign. decisionmakers. Another group, “control,” would feed them information about the actions of countries or groups not played by the participants or about world events that might influence the context of their actions. In more limited military simulations, extant or proposed war plans would be evaluated by computer or human players to identify possible flaws and improvements. The games themselves never had a guarantee of accuracy and were often quite obviously flawed. In one Navy game, American aircraft carriers were declared to be unsinkable. In others, the Soviet Union was assumed to have no effective airpower. Because factors like air pressure, prevailing winds, defense effectiveness, early warning, and missile failure rate were largely random or incalculable, a “fudge factor” simply declared estimated success. Even their designers sometimes admitted that the games were inaccurate, unprovable, or simply wishful thinking (Ghamari-Tabrizi 8; Allen 78). Especially in the case of nuclear war, these games cannot possibly be understood as accurate simulations of a real-world system, because there is no empirical data on the compound effects of many near-simultaneous nuclear explosions and no data on what factors cause states to cross the nuclear threshold against other similarly-armed states, a fact that bedevils nuclear planning in general and always has (Kaplan 87). By the admission of many of those who create and play them, they are “social science fiction” with no tangible effect other than that they are entertaining (Ghamari-Tabrizi 160-1). Some contemporary social science work supports this claim especially in the context of extinction-level events. Human beings simply aren’t wired to think at such a scale, and they perform very poorly assessing probability and calculating magnitude (Yudkowsky). Others have suggested that warfare is a stochastic system that we could never identify laws for, no matter how diligent we might be, because its initial conditions are simply too complex a model and they do not conform to linear causality (Beyerchen; Buchanan 62). Indeed, military planners tended to be far less willing to predict the conduct and outcome of a conventional war—despite an enormous data set spanning thousands of years—than a nuclear war fought between two superpowers, an event that has never occurred in recorded history. Fred Iklé, former RAND strategists who was at times head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, criticized these semi-mathematical abstractions in harsh terms that deserve to be quoted at length: The prominence of the calculations continues because we know how to make them…we have tailored the problem to our capability to calculate. The seemingly rigorous models of nuclear deterrence are built on the rule: "What cannot be calculated, leave out’”…Such thoughts, especially those focusing on deterrence, lack real empirical referents or bases. No other field of human endeavor demands—absolutely compels—one to work out successful solutions without obtaining directly relevant experience, without experimenting. There can be no trial and error here, no real learning. Curiously, we are far more skeptical in accepting the calculations of traditional conventional military campaigns than the calculations of nuclear warfare. In fact, the more battle experience and information military analysts have, the more modest they become in predicting the course of conventional war. Such modesty is missing for nuclear war, where pretentious analyses and simplistic abstractions dominate and blot out the discrepancies existing between abstractions and possible reality—a reality that for so many reasons is hard even to imagine. (Iklé 246). Iklé is drawing attention to two unique aspects of nuclear war planning: first, that no empirical date (or at least very little) can be gathered for the species of war that planners concerned themselves with, and second, that unlike other military problems where little data exists, defense intellectuals were willing to display great confidence in untested (and untestable) theories. Despite this lack of empirical grounding, nuclear war simulations have been repeated again and again over the decades while nuclear doctrine has remained fundamentally the same (McKinzie et al. ix-xi). There has been some dispute in military circles about whether these exercises should be called simulations or games, with “simulations” becoming more popular by the 1980s (Allen 7). To call politico-military exercises “roleplaying games” conjures images of adolescent boys rolling dice and weaving fantasies about orcs and dragons. To call battle simulations “war games” might associate them with videogames produced for entertainment. Still, even military officers responsible for the creation of these artifacts had trouble distinguishing between game, model, and simulation and used them interchangeably. In his comprehensive history of U.S. wargaming, Thomas Allen writes that the three words “hover over imaginary battlefields like a mysterious, ever-shifting concept of the Trinity” (64, emphasis added). Berger, Boulay and Zisk, writing in the journal Simulation & Gaming acknowledge that “[d]efinitions of simulation are legion,” but center on representations of a system that allow users to model behavior (Berger et al. 416). Brewer and Shubik define games as a subset of simulation and simulation as a subset of modelling, the key defining feature of a game being the inclusion of human beings playing roles. Still, their extended attempt to define these terms results in the acronym MSG, grouping them all together (3-8). The difficulty in Brewer and Shubik’s definition is that all models and simulations require that human beings make decisions at least indirectly, at a minimum defining the independent variables and the parameters of the exercise. As a result, they all create some possibility for investment in the outcome. In common usage, the difference between simulations and models, on the one hand, and games, on the other appears to be a ludic dimension. Games are for play, with an agent making decisions within a set of prescribed rules to change the outcome, while simulations and models may simply represent the rules of a system. The least common denominator is that one rules-bound system—the game— stands in for another. Games, simulations, and models therefore have a metaphorical quality to them.10 In his work on videogames, Ian Bogost has identifies what he calls procedural rhetoric as “the practice of persuading through processes in general and computational processes in particular…a technique for making arguments with computational systems and for unpacking computational arguments others have created” (3). Whereas oral rhetoric attempts to persuade an audience to adopt a particular viewpoint through speech and written rhetoric does the same through writing, procedural rhetoric has its own unique goals and characteristics suited to the medium of games. Videogames create a digital process that simulates a real-world process, allowing the player to model something extant in the world of flesh, blood, steel and glass that exists outside of the game. Procedural rhetoric is the persuasive aspect of simulation. Bogost’s argument might be adapted to this understanding of metaphor. The replacement of the tenor (the thing represented) with the vehicle (the signifier standing in for it) makes an enthymematic argument that draws the audience to do the work of cathexis in connecting the two based on the shared principle that allows the substitution. This does not suggest that we read games as texts. Games require their players to invest in a specific way because they are called on to make choices that alter the outcome. Players identify with their characters in a powerful way: what is shared is not just a set of traits, but decisions over time that, to maintain the interest that keeps players playing, require at least some minimal attachment. One can identify deeply with Sauron, but no reading of Lord of the Rings can make him finally subjugate his haughty human and elven foes, let alone order the Scourging of the Shire and its disgustingly bourgeois hobbits when he still has a chance to succeed.11 This is the procedural element of Bogost’s theory: it is the procedure that links the system with its representation in the game, and the sense of control that binds us, something that differentiates this medium from others. One doesn’t have to decide that play matters and narrative doesn’t—it is the interaction between the two that channels the player’s investment in a game. In war games, attachments are formed even when a computerized Sam fights a computerized Ivan to test the SIOP and RSIOP.12 Allen’s book is full of examples of war game players becoming emotionally tied to their games, sometimes in perverse ways. Failing in a game that he was allowed to play, Allen himself described his team reacting with shock, real shock, not just a reaction to a bad break in a game. We were really feeling upset about what was happening in our imaginary world. ‘What is happening to our institutions?’ someone indignantly asked, as if real institutions were really going through what the situation paper had described. I had an unreasonable feeling of helplessness and failure. Some of us spoke softly to each other about having failed. (18). The prevalence of this reaction is confirmed in more recent scholarship by Paul Bracken, himself a war game participant. Bracken puts the case simply: “People get emotionally involved in games” (20).

## 1AC – U/V

### Theory

#### 1AR theory –

#### A] AFF gets it because otherwise the neg can engage in infinite abuse which outweighs their arguments

#### B] Drop the debater – the time crunched 1AR can’t win substance and theory to check abuse

#### C] Competing interps – 1AR interps aren’t bidirectional so they should defend their norm and the neg can always brute force their way through reasonability debates

### Substance

#### 1] Evergreening is done at a massive scale and is anti-competitive – that kills innovation.

UC Hastings Law, 9-24-2020, "Patent Database Exposes Pharma’s Pricey “Evergreen” Strategy," UC Hastings Law | San Francisco, https://www.uchastings.edu/2020/09/24/patent-drug-database/

AstraZeneca, Johnson & Johnson and Gilead lead a crowded field of drug makers who excessively extend patent protections to limit the market entry of competing products in an anti-competitive practice called “evergreening,” a primary driver of high drug prices. This is one finding of many according to a [public database](https://sites.uchastings.edu/evergreensearch/#.X2p1CC2ZNxg) created by the [Center for Innovation (C4i)](https://www.uchastings.edu/academics/centers/center-for-innovation/) at UC Hastings Law. The searchable database is the first of its kind to comprehensively track the patent protections filed by pharmaceutical companies. Using patent data from 2005-2018 on brand-name drugs listed in the Federal Drug Administration’s Orange Book, the database reveals the extent of the evergreening strategy used by pharma to prolong patents, often for trivial reasons, and delay the entry of competition, especially generics. The strategy helps drug companies maintain market share and contributes to high drug prices. AstraZeneca led the field in filing for patent protections — and the monopoly profits that go with them — with six drugs that rank among the top 20 drugs for the number of protections received. These protections combined to extend AstraZeneca’s market control by more than 90 years for drugs that treat prevalent diseases, such as diabetes and gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD). Additional findings exposed by the database include: Some of the most common medicines to receive extensions include widely prescribed medications such as insulin, HIV medications, drugs that treat pain, and those that treat opioid addiction. Johnson & Johnson’s Janssen Global HIV drug Prezista ranked second in number of protections, receiving 167 protections from 14 unique patents to delay competitor entry for 16 years. Gilead’s HIV drug Truvada ranked fourth in the top 20 with 120 protections (extending for more than 17 years), and its HIV drug Viread came in fifth with 118 protections (extending for more than 16 years). Many patent protections have been secured for trivial reasons. These changes are far less expensive for the companies to develop than discovering a new drug, suggesting that a financial market reward — rather than a patent — should be sufficient to incentivize innovation. AstraZeneca’s behavior includes actions where the company introduced new versions of its drugs in an evergreen practice called product hopping. AstraZeneca now appears to be evergreening their evergreens. For example, Prilosec product-hopped to Nexium and then protections were piled onto Nexium. Nine other companies have drugs that appear in the top 20, highlighting the broad use of evergreening practices across the industry. Even lower numbers of protections can extend market protection significantly. For example, Indivior’s widely prescribed Suboxone, which treats opioid addiction, obtained 11 protections and added more than 16 years to its market dominance. An earlier version of Suboxone even secured an Orphan Drug designation, which is supposed to be designed for drugs that serve a small volume of patients with no possibility of recouping investment, despite the fact that Suboxone became one of the company’s best-selling drugs in 2019. Significantly, insulin, which treats diabetes, is commonly evergreened but is no longer being regulated as a small molecule drug as of March 2020. This means it is now covered under the Federal Drug Administration’s Purple Book of biosimilar drugs, making the drug companies’ questionable patent behaviors surrounding these widely used drugs harder to detect in the future. “Competition is the backbone of the U.S. economy, but that’s not what we are seeing in the drug industry,” said [Professor Robin Feldman,](https://www.uchastings.edu/people/robin-feldman/) Director of the Center for Innovation. “The database clearly shows how the industry takes advantage of the patent system by blocking competition to protect their prices and revenue.” Drug patents are intended as time-limited government grants of market protection to incentivize drug companies so the companies will innovate new, life-saving medicines. After a limited period of time in which drug companies can earn a profit, competitors should be able to enter, driving drug prices down to competitive levels. “These drug tweaks may be enough to get these companies past the patent office, but they may not mean much in terms of a benefit to patients,” Feldman said. “Thus, society is lavishing expensive rewards on minimal improvements.” The Evergreen Drug Patent Search database is based on findings in Feldman’s paper, [“May Your Drug Price be Evergreen,”](https://academic.oup.com/jlb/article/5/3/590/5232981) which was published in the peer-reviewed Oxford Journal of Law and the Biosciences and has been updated with additional data. It was created by a painstaking process of combing through 160,000 data points to examine every instance in which a pharmaceutical company added a new drug patent or exclusivity. More information about the drug patent database can be found online at <https://sites.uchastings.edu/evergreensearch/>. The Evergreen Drug Patent Search was supported, in part, by Arnold Ventures, a philanthropic foundation.

#### 2] Companies arent innovating now. And the aff doesn’t harm innovation

Jung et al 19 [Emily H. Jung, is a first-year medical student at Emory School of Medicine in Atlanta and a former research assistant at the Program On Regulation, Therapeutics, And Law (PORTAL) in the Division of Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacoeconomics at Brigham and Women’s Hospital, Alfred Engelberg, a retired pharmaceutical intellectual property attorney and philanthropist. and Aaron S. Kesselheim, is a professor of medicine at Harvard Medical School and director of PORTAL. Funding for this work was provided by the Engelberg Foundation, a charitable foundation that focuses on health policy research. Kesselheim’s work is also supported by the Harvard-MIT Center for Regulatory Science and Arnold Ventures. 12-10-2019, “Do large pharma companies provide drug development innovation? Our analysis says no” STAT, Accessed 8-2-2021, <https://www.statnews.com/2019/12/10/large-pharma-companies-provide-little-new-drug-development-innovation/> ww

Large pharmaceutical companies oppose legislation being considered by Congress to lower the prices of prescription drugs. Reducing their revenues, they contend, will reduce their investment in drug development and the discovery of new medicines, and thus lead to a decline in drug innovation.¶ If that argument is credible, there should be evidence to show that the large pharmaceutical companies are responsible for discovering innovative new drugs.¶ To test that claim, we examined the provenance of the highest-selling prescription medicines of Pfizer and Johnson & Johnson, the two largest pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies in 2018.¶ We found that these large pharmaceutical companies did not actually invent most of the drugs they sell. Indeed, it appears they have already reduced their investment in the discovery of new medicines to the point where the threat of additional reductions rings hollow and is no longer a persuasive reason for opposing legislation to lower drug prices.¶ Pfizer’s and J&J’s annual reports identify the medications that account for most of each company’s sales of prescription drugs. We gathered information on the discovery and early development of these products from peer-reviewed publications, media reports, and company press releases.¶ We scoured the companies’ 2017 annual reports. A total of 62 products — 44 from Pfizer and 18 from J&J — were listed in them. The discovery and early development work were conducted in house for just 10 of Pfizer’s 44 products (23%), as listed in Table 1. Only two of J&J’s 18 leading products (11%) were discovered in house, as shown in Table 2.¶ For example, sildenafil, the phosphodiesterase inhibitor that is the active compound in the erectile dysfunction drug Viagra and the pulmonary hypertension drug Revatio, was synthesized at Pfizer in the 1980s, originally as a cardiovascular medicine. Research leading to the development of risperidone (Risperdal), one of several newer-generation atypical antipsychotic drugs, began at J&J in the 1980s.¶ The majority (81%) of other products were discovered and initially developed by third parties. Some of them came to Pfizer and J&J from the acquisition of other pharmaceutical companies. For example, Pfizer’s highest-selling product, Prevnar 13, a vaccine for pneumococcal disease, was developed at Wyeth, which Pfizer acquired in 2009. Pfizer’s palbociclib (Ibrance), used to treat breast cancer, had its origins at Warner-Lambert and Onyx Pharmaceuticals. J&J’s rivaroxaban (Xarelto), an anticoagulant, originated at Bayer.¶ Research leading to the discovery and development of other Pfizer and J&J drugs originated in universities and academic centers. J&J’s highest-selling product, infliximab (Remicade), is a monoclonal antibody that was synthesized by researchers at New York University in 1989 in collaboration with the biotechnology company Centocor. The original work showing its efficacy in rheumatoid arthritis was led by Marc Feldmann and Ravinder Maini at Imperial College London.¶ Etanercept (Enbrel), tofacitinib (Xeljanz), darunavir (Prezista), and daratumumab (Darzalex) are other products for which key discovery or development steps occurred in academic settings.¶ The 34 Pfizer products discovered by third parties accounted for 86% of the $37.6 billion in revenue that its 44 leading products generated. The 16 J&J products invented elsewhere accounted for 89% of the $31.4 billion that its 18 leading products generated. Clearly, the existence of Pfizer and J&J as profitable pharmaceutical manufacturers is dependent on the acquisition of drugs invented by third parties.¶ Our finding that few of the top-selling drugs made by Pfizer and J&J had been discovered in-house complements a recent Government Accountability Office report examining where large pharmaceutical companies spend most of their research dollars. It is also consistent with the latest member survey conducted by PhRMA, which indicated that last year only $13 billion was spent on preclinical studies — the basic and translational science that is the foundation for the discovery of innovative drugs.¶ That is only a fraction of the $39.2 billion taxpayers spent to support the medical research conducted by the National Institutes of Health. More than 80% of the NIH’s funding is awarded through almost 50,000 competitive grants to more than 300,000 researchers at 2,500+ universities, medical schools, and other research institutions in every state and around the world. While it is important to give fair consideration to the cost and risk involved in the development of new drugs, Pfizer and J&J were mostly buying drugs that had already been shown to have efficacy.¶ The lack of in-house innovation at Pfizer and J&J is relevant to current efforts in the Senate (S. 2543) to limit annual drug price increases to the rate of inflation, and in the House of Representatives (H.R. 3) to cap drug price increases and limit prices based on what is charged for the same drug in other developed countries.¶ Large pharmaceutical manufacturers have claimed that enactment of this legislation would be an “innovation killer” and trigger a “nuclear winter for the U.S. biopharmaceutical ecosystem.” And President Trump tweeted late last month that the Pelosi drug pricing bill “doesn’t do the trick. FEWER cures! FEWER treatments!”¶ ¶ If our findings are representative of the level of innovation at other large pharmaceutical manufacturers, a reduction in pharmaceutical revenues would not have the supposed devastating impact on the level of biopharmaceutical innovation. Rather, a reduction in revenues as a result of lower drug prices may reduce the astronomical acquisition prices now being paid by the large manufacturers to acquire innovations made by others.¶ But the biopharmaceutical ecosystem will continue to thrive as long as those who actually innovate are provided with the resources to do so while those who play other roles in bringing new drugs to market are fairly compensated for their contributions to those aspects of the development process.¶ As a recent report from the National Academies of Medicine concluded, “drugs that are not affordable are of little value and drugs that do not exist are of no value.” The problem of affordability will not be solved if Congress continues to succumb to questionable assertions by lobbyists claiming that excessively high drug prices are essential to maintaining biopharmaceutical innovation.¶ Passage of legislation to curb ridiculously high medication prices and price increases will not only make medicines more accessible to patients but will also reduce government expenditures on drugs by more than $345 billion dollars over 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. That will enable the government to make greater investments in NIH and produce an even more robust biomedical innovation ecosystem than now exists.

### Pluralism

#### Methodological pluralism is a necessary aspect of critique.

Bleiker ’14 [Roland, professor of international relations at the university of Queensland. “International Theory Between Reification and Self-Reflective Critique” International Studies Review, Volume 16, Issue 2. June 17, 2014]

This book is part of an increasing trend of scholarly works that have embraced poststructural critique but want to ground it in more positive political foundations, while retaining a reluctance to return to the positivist tendencies that implicitly underpin much of constructivist research. The path that Daniel Levine has carved out is innovative, sophisticated, and convincing. A superb scholarly achievement. For Levine, the key challenge in international relations (IR) scholarship is what he calls “unchecked reification”: the widespread and dangerous process of forgetting “the distinction between theoretical concepts and the real-world things they mean to describe or to which they refer” (p. 15). The dangers are real, Levine stresses, because IR deals with some of the most difficult issues, from genocides to war. Upholding one subjective position without critical scrutiny can thus have far-reaching consequences. Following Theodor Adorno—who is the key theoretical influence on this book—Levine takes a post-positive position and assumes that the world cannot be known outside of our human perceptions and the values that are inevitably intertwined with them. His ultimate goal is to overcome reification, or, to be more precise, to recognize it as an inevitable aspect of thought so that its dangerous consequences can be mitigated. Levine proceeds in three stages: First he reviews several decades of IR theories to resurrect critical moments when scholars displayed an acute awareness of the dangers of reification. He refreshingly breaks down distinctions between conventional and progressive scholarship, for he detects self-reflective and critical moments in scholars that are usually associated with straightforward positivist positions (such as E.H. Carr, Hans Morgenthau, or Graham Allison). But Levine also shows how these moments of self-reflexivity never lasted long and were driven out by the compulsion to offer systematic and scientific knowledge. The second stage of Levine's inquiry outlines why IR scholars regularly closed down critique. Here, he points to a range of factors and phenomena, from peer review processes to the speed at which academics are meant to publish. And here too, he eschews conventional wisdom, showing that work conducted in the wake of the third debate, while explicitly post-positivist and critiquing the reifying tendencies of existing IR scholarship, often lacked critical self-awareness. As a result, Levine believes that many of the respective authors failed to appreciate sufficiently that “reification is a consequence of all thinking—including itself” (p. 68). The third objective of Levine's book is also the most interesting one. Here, he outlines the path toward what he calls “sustainable critique”: a form of self-reflection that can counter the dangers of reification. Critique, for him, is not just something that is directed outwards, against particular theories or theorists. It is also inward-oriented, ongoing, and sensitive to the “limitations of thought itself” (p. 12). The challenges that such a sustainable critique faces are formidable. Two stand out: First, if the natural tendency to forget the origins and values of our concepts are as strong as Levine and other Adorno-inspired theorists believe they are, then how can we actually recognize our own reifying tendencies? Are we not all inevitably and subconsciously caught in a web of meanings from which we cannot escape? Second, if one constantly questions one's own perspective, does one not fall into a relativism that loses the ability to establish the kind of stable foundations that are necessary for political action? Adorno has, of course, been critiqued as relentlessly negative, even by his second-generation Frankfurt School successors (from Jürgen Habermas to his IR interpreters, such as Andrew Linklater and Ken Booth). The response that Levine has to these two sets of legitimate criticisms are, in my view, both convincing and useful at a practical level. He starts off with depicting reification not as a flaw that is meant to be expunged, but as an a priori condition for scholarship. The challenge then is not to let it go unchecked. Methodological pluralism lies at the heart of Levine's sustainable critique. He borrows from what Adorno calls a “constellation”: an attempt to juxtapose, rather than integrate, different perspectives. It is in this spirit that Levine advocates multiple methods to understand the same event or phenomena. He writes of the need to validate “multiple and mutually incompatible ways of seeing” (p. 63, see also pp. 101–102). In this model, a scholar oscillates back and forth between different methods and paradigms, trying to understand the event in question from multiple perspectives. No single method can ever adequately represent the event or should gain the upper hand. But each should, in a way, recognize and capture details or perspectives that the others cannot (p. 102). In practical terms, this means combining a range of methods even when—or, rather, precisely when—they are deemed incompatible. They can range from poststructual deconstruction to the tools pioneered and championed by positivist social sciences. The benefit of such a methodological polyphony is not just the opportunity to bring out nuances and new perspectives. Once the false hope of a smooth synthesis has been abandoned, the very incompatibility of the respective perspectives can then be used to identify the reifying tendencies in each of them. For Levine, this is how reification may be “checked at the source” and this is how a “critically reflexive moment might thus be rendered sustainable” (p. 103). It is in this sense that Levine's approach is not really post-foundational but, rather, an attempt to “balance foundationalisms against one another” (p. 14). There are strong parallels here with arguments advanced by assemblage thinking and complexity theory—links that could have been explored in more detail.

### Newman

#### Politics can be criticism rather than affirmation – making demands on the state does not mean endorsing it.

Saul Newman 10, Reader in Political Theory at Goldsmiths, U of London, Theory & Event Volume 13, Issue 2

There are two aspects that I would like to address here. Firstly, the notion of demand: making certain demands on the state – say for higher wages, equal rights for excluded groups, to not go to war, or an end to draconian policing – is one of the basic strategies of social movements and radical groups. Making such demands does not necessarily mean working within the state or reaffirming its legitimacy.