# 1NC vs Elmer Evergreening

## 1NC

### NC – Theory

#### A] Interpretation: Debaters must disclose previously run constructive positions – all cases, off cases and theory arguments – at least 30 minutes before the round on the NDCA wiki. This means providing proper citations for all evidence including first three and last three words and tags as well as all advocacy texts and framework arguments.

#### B] Violation:

Table

Description automatically generated with low confidence

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

#### C] Prefer—

#### 1] Quality engagement—disclosure allows in-depth preparation before the round which checks back against unpredictable positions - allows for reciprocal engagement

#### 2] Predictability – it’s a norm to disclose on the wiki and respond to disclosure questions; even if they read the same aff, it means Im unsure what to prep pre-round

#### D] Voters—

#### Fairness is a voter—debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation. Education is a voter—it’s intrinsic to debate.

### NC – T

#### Interpretation: The aff must defend that member nations reduce intellectual property protections for all medicines

#### The upward entailment test and adverb test determine the genericity of a bare plural

Leslie and Lerner 16 [Sarah-Jane Leslie, Ph.D., Princeton, 2007. Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. Served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University. Adam Lerner, PhD Philosophy, Postgraduate Research Associate, Princeton 2018. From 2018, Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow in the Center for Bioethics at New York University. Member of the [Princeton Social Neuroscience Lab](http://psnlab.princeton.edu/).] “Generic Generalizations.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. April 24, 2016. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/> TG

1. Generics and Logical Form

In English, generics can be expressed using a variety of syntactic forms: bare plurals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), indefinite singulars (e.g., “a tiger is striped”), and definite singulars (“the tiger is striped”). However, none of these syntactic forms is dedicated to expressing generic claims; each can also be used to express existential and/or specific claims. Further, some generics express what appear to be generalizations over individuals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), while others appear to predicate properties directly of the kind (e.g., “dodos are extinct”). These facts and others give rise to a number of questions concerning the logical forms of generic statements.

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), some individual tiger in ([2b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex2b)), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in ([3b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex3b))—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.

The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with “some” with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology “existential reading”. The application of the term “existential interpretation” is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a kind.

There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, “tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) does not entail that animals are striped, but ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.)

#### It applies to “Medicines” – adding “generally” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning and the rez doesn’t entail reducing IP protections for all biotechnology

**Violation: companies can choose a form of protection that doesn't get reduced**

**(from their solvency advocate)**

a pharmaceutical company chooses whether its period of exclusivity would be a patent, an orphan drug designation, a period of data exclusivity (in which no generic is allowed to use the original drug’s safety and effectiveness data), or something else — but **not all of the above**

#### Net benefits -

#### [1] Limits – 580 recognized medicines plus combinations makes negating impossible especially with no unifying disads against medicines with different policies, implementation and IP procedures

#### [2] Precision outweighs – it determines which interps your ballot can endorse by providing the only salient focal point for debates—if their interp is not premised on the text of the resolution, its benefits are irrelevant to the question of topicality since it fails to interpret the topic

#### [3] Ground - The aff can claim any advantage to a virtual infinite combination of affs and the lack of predictability for negatives means virtually no DAs are applicable because Affirmatives can de-link out of them.

#### DTD on T-- indicts their ability to read the aff and the debate shouldn’t have happened to begin w if the aff was abusive

#### Competing Interps on T since its binary and a question of models—reasonability arbitrary

### NC – T

#### Interp: Reduce means unconditional and permanent

**Reynolds 59** – Judge (In the Matter of Doris A. Montesani, Petitioner, v. Arthur Levitt, as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al., Respondents [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL] Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department 9 A.D.2d 51; 189 N.Y.S.2d 695; 1959 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 7391 August 13, 1959, lexis)

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway.  [\*\*\*13]  The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency.

#### Violation: The plan is voluntary

#### Vote neg for limits and ground – they can defend affs that are extremely time-limited, which moots core neg ground predicated on the structure of IPR and long term impacts. Allows the aff to no link out of every Disad, and means we have to resort to stale generics

### CP -- SCOTUS

SCOTUS CP:

#### States except the United States ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines by implementing a one-and-done approach for patent protection.

#### The United States Federal Judiciary ought to rule that not reducing intellectual property protections for medicines by implementing a one-and-done approach for patent protection is unconstitutional.

#### Solves and they can do it – empirical influence over medicine

Capone 20 [Connie Capone, writer for MDLinx, September 3, 2020. “Court rulings that changed medicine” [https://www.mdlinx.com/article/court-rulings-that-changed-medicine/147FEf8WGxGdBQI4b8HG7u Accessed 8/27](https://www.mdlinx.com/article/court-rulings-that-changed-medicine/147FEf8WGxGdBQI4b8HG7u%20Accessed%208/27) //gord0]

What happens when technology firms, insurance companies, healthcare systems, and even the US government encroach on medical practice? In short, the courts get involved. Court decisions have frequently ruled on medical ethics and shaped healthcare policy. Landmark Supreme Court cases and lower court rulings have set the tone on medical ethics and shaped healthcare policy. Here are five such cases that made their mark on medicine. Vizzoni v. Mulford-Dera, 2019 In this case, the Superior Court of New Jersey Appellate Division upheld a trial court [decision](https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/sustainability/new-jersey-court-weighs-whether-non-patient-can-sue-physician) to dismiss a malpractice lawsuit after the family of a New Jersey woman who was killed during a car-bicycle accident sued the driver’s psychiatrist for medical negligence. The psychiatrist had been treating the driver, Barbara Mulford-Dera, for psychological conditions, and when Mulford-Dera struck and killed the cyclist, she had been taking a prescription medication that she allegedly did not know made it dangerous to drive. The bicyclist’s family maintained that the psychiatrist should have disclosed the potentially harmful effects of driving while under the influence of the prescribed psychotropic medication. But the trial court dismissed the case, ruling that it was not medical negligence. In an amicus brief, the American Medical Association warned that expanding physician legal obligations to the general public would have profound negative implications for medical professionals. State of Washington v. US Department of Health and Human Services, 2019 In this case, a federal judge in Washington issued a nationwide injunction blocking a series of proposed abortion restrictions. The restrictions, issued by the Trump administration, would have barred federally funded family planning facilities from advising or assisting patients seeking an abortion. Facilities backed by federal funding under the Title X program, including Planned Parenthood, were already prohibited from using those funds to perform abortions, but under this so-called “gag rule,” they would no longer be able to say or do anything to assist patients who were seeking an abortion, including referring them for abortion procedures. The rule was promulgated in March 2019 by the Department of Health and Human Services, and blocked by a federal judge the following month. In support of the injunction against the proposed plan, Washington state Attorney General Bob Ferguson [said](https://www.governor.wa.gov/news-media/updated-statements-inslee-and-ag-ferguson-regarding-judges-national-injunction-ruling) that it “ensures that clinics across the nation can remain open and continue to provide quality, unbiased healthcare to women.” National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius, 2012 In a Supreme Court ruling, a key provision in the Affordable Care Act (ACA), passed by Congress in 2010, was upheld. The ACA, created during the Obama administration, contained an individual mandate that required all Americans to buy health insurance or pay a tax penalty. It also required states to expand their Medicaid programs or risk losing federal funding. The court upheld the individual mandate on American citizens but rejected the provision to withhold federal funding from states that didn’t expand Medicaid, ruling that state participation in the program would be voluntary. “The Affordable Care Act’s requirement that certain individuals pay a financial penalty for not obtaining health insurance may reasonably be characterized as a tax,” Chief Justice John Roberts wrote in the [ruling](https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/11-393#writing-11-393_OPINION_3). “Because the Constitution permits such a tax, it is not our role to forbid it, or to pass upon its wisdom or fairness.”

#### The Courts are key --- reaffirming judicial supremacy is necessary to check back on majoritarian power and preserve a system of checks and balances --- that prevents the collapse of democracy

Redish and Heins 16 [Martin Redish, Louis and Harriet Ancel Professor of Law and Public Policy, Northwestern University School of Law. Matthew Heins, B.A. 2009, University of Southern California; J.D. 2015, Northwestern University School of Law. “Premodern Constitutionalism.” April 15, 2016. https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3651&context=wmlr]

The argument Kramer and others advance is not only normatively unpersuasive, it is also logically untenable in light of the structural Constitution and the basic premises of American constitutionalism. As we explained in Part I, the traditionalist view understands the value of countermajoritarian checking as a political mechanism for enshrining skeptical optimism, which can be readily deduced from the Constitutions structural design. Our constitutionalism is thus principally concerned with facilitating democracy while promoting rule of law values and protecting minorities.296 The reality is that any argument that temporary majorities or the governmental bodies that are directly accountable to those majorities are either more capable or more suitable arbiters of constitutional meaning ignores the careful framework for promoting these values that was etched into our supreme law at the constitutional convention. Our proclaimed unflagging commitment to due process of law, the existence of a supreme document ratified by supermajoritarian movement and subject to formal alteration only through a supermajoritarian process, and our provision of a politically insulated judiciary are all brightly flashing signals that our system understands the importance of speed bumps to slow majorities down. Popular constitutionalism seems to forget or intentionally ignore all of this. 297 Mark Tushnets case against judicial supremacy directly takes on Larry Alexanders and Frederick Schauers defense of judicial review.298 Alexander and Schauer assert that without judicial supremacy we would have a system of interpretive anarchy on our hands.299 The role of the Supreme Court, say Alexander and Schauer, is to provide a single authoritative interpreter to which others must defer, to serve the settlement function of the law. 300 Tushnet responds that when it declares that Congress has overstepped its bounds, the Court justifies its behavior using the selfinterestedness of the Congress: Congress is self-interested when it defines the scope of its own power. Members of Congress have an interest in maximizing their own power by expanding their sphere of power and responsibilities. Any decision [Congress] make[s], no matter how fully deliberated, will be shaped, and perhaps distorted, by this self-interest. 301 But this is an objection equally available to those who would question the Courts version of judicial supremacy, because the judiciary is just as apt to act self-interestedly and expand its own power.302 This position runs directly contrary to the basic principles underlying the structural Constitution. Tushnets argument essentially ignores the fact that the judiciary was built to be (1) limited in active power, and (2) countermajoritarian, staffed by insulated judges with salary and tenure protections. With the exception of issues surrounding its own powers, the judiciary is uniquely positioned to serve as the neutral adjudicator that can settle disputes as to the boundaries between executive and legislative, as well as federal and state branches. More importantly, if the judiciary were not tasked with settling the boundaries of majoritarian power, there would be no countermajoritarian check at all, and the Constitution would essentially be meaningless. And even as to its own power, the Courts authorityunlike that of Congress or the Presidentis confined to a passive role, awaiting cases to adjudicate.303 It therefore makes sense to give the Court final say as to its own constitutional power in order to protect its countermajoritarian role.304 Under a regime of judicial supremacy, the judiciary is no more capable of aggrandizement than is Congress. Professor Tushnet looks to City of Boerne v. Flores to show how the Court gives deference to Congress and assumes laws are constitutional because Congress has a duty to support the Constitution, but the Court does not give deference to congressional redefinitions of its own power because Congress is self-interested.305 But, he argues, the Court is no less self-interested because every institution with both power and the ability to aggrandize it will seek to expand or enhance that power.306 Both of Professor Tushnets proof points are flawed. The Court is no more empowered to engage in self-aggrandizement than is Congress, considering that Congress is arguably capable of simply stripping the federal courts of jurisdiction (within constitutional limits) whenever it chooses.307 Why would it be, under Tushnets theory, that the Framers would devise a constitutional system in which the Congress could be trusted to determine the scope of its own power, disregarding judicial pronouncements of the limits of that power, and then could strip the courts of jurisdiction to hear any challenges to such self-aggrandizement? Tushnet has effectively written Article III out of the Constitution. And although he focuses his attention on the fact that the Court is no more a single authoritative interpreterthan is Congressor maybe even less singular, because each individual voice is so much more meaningful on the Court308Tushnet forgets that Congress represents hundreds of millions of people and is, at some level, subject to their momentary preferences. What makes the Court uniquely capable of serving as the final voice of constitutional interpretationthe single authoritative interpreter that Alexander and Schauer describe and that the Framers envisioned is that it is insulated from such political pressure.309 Arguing that judicial supremacy distorts legislation, Professor Tushnet suggests that without it, Congress would act more responsibly in interpreting and abiding by the Constitution.310 For example, in the context of flag burning, he contends that judicial supremacy problematically prevented Congress from doing what its members and the people wantednamely, passing an effective law against the burning of the American flag.311 But that is exactly the point. Presumably by the exact same reasoning, it could have been argued that during the McCarthy era, the judiciary should not have been allowed to prevent the majority from doing what it wanted to do namely, suppress left-wing dissenters. The entire purpose of our structural Constitution is to embed Founding-era American skeptical optimism and force the majority, if it wishes to circumvent those fundamental truths, to garner enough supermajoritarian support to change them. If the American people are so concerned with flag burning, it is a good thing to require them to amend the Constitution formally, by means of the prescribed supermajoritarian process312to render constitutional those state or federal laws that ban it. If burning the flag is a method of expression, and laws forbidding it are contrary to the First Amendment because of their communicative impact, the people may amend the Constitution to declare thatflag-burning laws are an exception to the Amendments general coverage.313 Tushnet believes that lawmakers may apply their own conception of the Constitution if they are conscientious and if their interpretation is reasonable, 314 but this begs the question: Who is to decide whether a lawmaker has conscientiously considered and reasonably interpreted the Constitution? The lawmaker himself? Our constitutional democracy cannot survive such constant, momentary, self-interested reinterpretation. Tushnet says it is wrong to assume that members of Congress are inherently incapable of interpreting the Constitution.315 But the traditionalist view of American constitutionalism in no way stands for the position that Congress is incapable of properly exercising interpretive authority. To the contrary, we both hope and assume that Congress is doing just that in deciding whether to enact legislation. The Constitution does not in any way prohibit the majoritarian branches from ever exercising interpretive authority; in fact, as Professor Paulsen discusses with great alacrity, each and every politically accountable member of the federal government takes an oath to support the Constitution.316 Congress might be undereducated about the Constitution, and it might be that Congress would improve without the judiciary as a backstop, especially if given the same kind of institutional support that the executive receives in its endeavors of constitutional interpretation, such as the Solicitor Generals Office and the Department of Justices Office of Legal Counsel. 317 But this misses the point entirely. The problem is not that Congress is bad at constitutional interpretationit is that because of its inherently majoritarian nature, Congress is structurally incapable of effectively policing majoritarian threats to the values and dictates embodied in the countermajoritarian Constitution. This is especially true when Congress itself creates those threats. Thus, our structural Constitution does not envision Congress as the final interpreter, and for good reason. The peoples elected representatives exist to advance the current and future interests of their constituents; the courts exist to ensure that those current and future legislative and policy choices adhere to foundational principles embodied in the nations countermajoritarian supreme law.

#### Democratic backsliding causes extinction.

Kendall-Taylor 16 [Andrea; Deputy national intelligence officer for Russia and Eurasia at the National Intelligence Council, Senior associate in the Human Rights Initiative at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington; “How Democracy’s Decline Would Undermine the International Order,” CSIS; 7/15/16; <https://www.csis.org/analysis/how-democracy%E2%80%99s-decline-would-undermine-international-order>/] Justin

It is rare that policymakers, analysts, and academics agree. But there is an emerging consensus in the world of foreign policy: threats to the stability of the current international order are rising. The norms, values, laws, and institutions that have undergirded the international system and governed relationships between nations are being gradually dismantled. The most discussed sources of this pressure are [the ascent of China](http://nationalinterest.org/feature/how-china-sees-world-order-15846) and other non-Western countries, Russia’s assertive foreign policy, and the diffusion of power from traditional nation-states to nonstate actors, such as nongovernmental organizations, multinational corporations, and technology-empowered individuals. Largely missing from these discussions, however, is the [specter of widespread democratic decline](http://www.journalofdemocracy.org/article/facing-democratic-recession). Rising challenges to democratic governance across the globe are a major strain on the international system, but they receive [far less attention](http://www.iiss.org/en/publications/survival/sections/2016-5e13/survival--global-politics-and-strategy-april-may-2016-eb2d/58-2-03-boyle-6dbd) in discussions of the shifting world order.

In the 70 years since the end of World War II, the United States has fostered a global order dominated by states that are liberal, capitalist, and democratic. The United States has promoted the spread of democracy to strengthen global norms and rules that constitute the foundation of our current international system. However, despite the steady rise of democracy since the end of the Cold War, over the last 10 years we have seen dramatic reversals in respect for democratic principles across the globe. [A 2015 Freedom House report](https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/01152015_FIW_2015_final.pdf) stated that the “acceptance of democracy as the world’s dominant form of government—and of an international system built on democratic ideals—is under greater threat than at any point in the last 25 years.”

Although the number of democracies in the world is at an all-time high, there are a number of [key trends](file:///C:\Users\PMeylan\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\5V2CJVRN\160715_KendallTaylor_DemocracysDecline_Commentary.docx#http://www.journalofdemocracy.org/article/democracy-decline) that are working to undermine democracy. The rollback of democracy in a few influential states or even in a number of less consequential ones would almost certainly accelerate meaningful changes in today’s global order.

Democratic decline would weaken U.S. partnerships and erode an important foundation for U.S. cooperation abroad. [Research demonstrates](file:///C:\Users\PMeylan\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\5V2CJVRN\160715_KendallTaylor_DemocracysDecline_Commentary.docx#http://cmp.sagepub.com/content/18/1/49.abstract) that domestic politics are a key determinant of the international behavior of states. In particular, democracies are more likely to form alliances and cooperate more fully with other democracies than with autocracies. Similarly, authoritarian countries have established mechanisms for cooperation and sharing of “worst practices.” An increase in authoritarian countries, then, would provide a broader platform for coordination that could enable these countries to overcome their divergent histories, values, and interests—factors that are frequently cited as obstacles to the formation of a cohesive challenge to the U.S.-led international system.

Recent examples support the empirical data. Democratic backsliding in Hungary and the hardening of Egypt’s autocracy under Abdel Fattah el-Sisi have led to enhanced relations between these countries and Russia. Likewise, democratic decline in Bangladesh has led Sheikh Hasina Wazed and her ruling Awami League to seek closer relations with China and Russia, in part to mitigate Western pressure and bolster the regime’s domestic standing.

Although none of these burgeoning relationships has developed into a highly unified partnership, democratic backsliding in these countries has provided a basis for cooperation where it did not previously exist. And while the United States certainly finds common cause with authoritarian partners on specific issues, the depth and reliability of such cooperation is limited. Consequently, further democratic decline could seriously compromise the United States’ ability to form the kinds of deep partnerships that will be required to confront today’s increasingly complex challenges. Global issues such as climate change, migration, and violent extremism demand the coordination and cooperation that democratic backsliding would put in peril. Put simply, the United States is a less effective and influential actor if it loses its ability to rely on its partnerships with other democratic nations.

A slide toward authoritarianism could also challenge the current global order by diluting U.S. influence in critical international institutions, including the [United Nations](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/christopher-walker-authoritarian-regimes-are-changing-how-the-world-defines-democracy/2014/06/12/d1328e3a-f0ee-11e3-bf76-447a5df6411f_story.html) , the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Democratic decline would weaken Western efforts within these institutions to advance issues such as Internet freedom and the responsibility to protect. In the case of Internet governance, for example, Western democracies support an open, largely private, global Internet. Autocracies, in contrast, promote state control over the Internet, including laws and other mechanisms that facilitate their ability to censor and persecute dissidents. Already many autocracies, including Belarus, China, Iran, and Zimbabwe, have coalesced in the “Likeminded Group of Developing Countries” within the United Nations to advocate their interests.

Within the IMF and World Bank, autocracies—along with other developing nations—seek to water down conditionality or the reforms that lenders require in exchange for financial support. If successful, diminished conditionality would enfeeble an important incentive for governance reforms. In a more extreme scenario, the rising influence of autocracies could enable these countries to bypass the IMF and World Bank all together. For example, the Chinese-created Asian Infrastructure and Investment Bank and the BRICS Bank—which includes Russia, China, and an increasingly authoritarian South Africa—provide countries with the potential to bypass existing global financial institutions when it suits their interests. Authoritarian-led alternatives pose the risk that global economic governance will become [fragmented and less effective](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00396338.2016.1161899?journalCode=tsur20#.V2H3MRbXgdI).

Violence and instability would also likely increase if more democracies give way to autocracy. [International relations literature](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/1995-05-01/democratization-and-war) tells us that democracies are less likely to fight wars against other democracies, suggesting that interstate wars would rise as the number of democracies declines. Moreover, within countries that are already autocratic, additional movement away from democracy, or an “authoritarian hardening,” would increase global instability. Highly repressive autocracies are the most likely to experience state failure, as was the case in the Central African Republic, Libya, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen. In this way, democratic decline would significantly strain the international order because rising levels of instability would exceed the West’s ability to respond to the tremendous costs of peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, and refugee flows.

Finally, widespread democratic decline would contribute to rising anti-U.S. sentiment that could fuel a global order that is increasingly antagonistic to the United States and its values. Most autocracies are highly suspicious of U.S. intentions and view the creation of an external enemy as an effective means for boosting their own public support. Russian president Vladimir Putin, Venezuelan president Nicolas Maduro, and Bolivian president Evo Morales regularly accuse the United States of fomenting instability and supporting regime change. This vilification of the United States is a convenient way of distracting their publics from regime shortcomings and fostering public support for strongman tactics.

Since 9/11, and particularly in the wake of the Arab Spring, Western enthusiasm for democracy support has waned. Rising levels of instability, including in Ukraine and the Middle East, fragile governance in Afghanistan and Iraq, and sustained threats from terrorist groups such as ISIL have increased Western focus on security and stability. U.S. preoccupation with intelligence sharing, basing and overflight rights, along with the perception that autocracy equates with stability, are trumping democracy and human rights considerations.

While rising levels of global instability explain part of Washington’s shift from an historical commitment to democracy, the nature of the policy process itself is a less appreciated factor. Policy discussions tend to occur on a country-by-country basis—leading to choices that weigh the costs and benefits of democracy support within the confines of a single country. From this perspective, the benefits of counterterrorism cooperation or access to natural resources are regularly judged to outweigh the perceived costs of supporting human rights. A serious problem arises, however, when this process is replicated across countries. The bilateral focus rarely incorporates the risks to the U.S.-led global order that arise from widespread democratic decline across multiple countries.

Many of the threats to the current global order, such as China’s rise or the diffusion of power, are driven by factors that the United States and West more generally have little leverage to influence or control. Democracy, however, is an area where Western actions can affect outcomes. Factoring in the risks that arise from a global democratic decline into policy discussions is a vital step to building a comprehensive approach to democracy support. Bringing this perspective to the table may not lead to dramatic shifts in foreign policy, but it would ensure that we are having the right conversation.

#### Aff is congress

#### 1] Spec – lack of it in the 1ac means default to 1nc NM ev. Anything else lets the 1ar shift the direction of the aff based on the 1nc strategy which crowds out the only core generics on the topic. Normal means doesn’t solve bc they will contest it in the 1ar and change their strategy based on the 1nc. No infinite regress because we only want you to spec one thing. CX doesn’t check because we construct the 1nc pre-round and debaters are intentionally shifty to avoid deep clash.

#### 2] Congress for this topic.

Orelli and Speights 5/29 [Dr. Orelli is a Senior Biotech Specialist. He has written about biotech, pharmaceutical, and medical device companies for The Motley Fool since 2007. May 29, 2021. “Will Patent Waivers Hurt COVID-19 Vaccine Companies?” [Will Patent Waivers Hurt COVID-19 Vaccine Companies? | The Motley Fool](https://www.fool.com/investing/2021/05/29/will-patent-waivers-hurt-covid-19-vaccine-companie/) Accessed 9/3 //gord0]

**Brian Orelli**: Last week, the Biden administration endorsed a proposal to waive COVID-19 vaccine patent rights. How big of a deal is this for the current vaccine makers like Moderna, BioNTech, Pfizer, and Johnson & Johnson?

**Keith Speights**: I really don't think that this is as big of a deal as some people are making it out to be. Certainly, not as big of a deal as the declines for the stocks showed last week.

I noticed that Moderna's CEO said publicly that he didn't lose a minute of sleep over this news. I think he's right; he shouldn't have lost any sleep. His reasoning was that there are other companies that, if they had access to the technology, they're not going to have the expertise to make the messenger RNA vaccines that Moderna makes. His thought was, "Look, even if this happens, we're not going to be threatened all that much." I suspect that he is right.

Now, Pfizer's CEO, Albert Bourla, did express some concerns. He wrote in a statement that this proposed intellectual-property-rights waiver could actually create more problems than it would solve. Bourla noted that infrastructure really isn't the bottleneck for Pfizer; it is the availability of raw materials. He thinks that this IP waiver would kick off a global scramble for those raw materials. The companies that don't have much expertise developing these vaccines could potentially disrupt the supply chain for companies like Pfizer that do have the expertise.

It wouldn't surprise me if that scenario that Bourla described might would happen to some extent. However, I would think that companies like Pfizer and Moderna would likely be able to pay a lot more for these raw materials and secure the suppliers they need and put the other companies that are trying to make these vaccines on their own at a severe disadvantage. But if that happened, I would think that Pfizer, Moderna would probably have to hike their prices to countries like the U.S. that could pay up.

Bourla also expressed some concerns that this move could provide disincentives to companies to take risks in the future. My thought on that, though, if it's only a temporary thing, it probably wouldn't be too much of an issue. But I think the big story [laughs] here is that this is probably all much ado about nothing, because Germany has already come out and said they are opposed to granting this temporary waiver and they are a member of the World Trade Organization, and from what I understand, Brian, they have veto power like other WTO members do. If Germany vetoes this, then all of this talk is a waste of time. [laughs] So I don't think this is going to be a big deal. I don't think it's going to go through, but even if it does, I just don't think this is a huge deal for Pfizer and Moderna and some of the other big vaccine makers.

**Orelli**: If it does go through, do you think it's a slippery slope? This is a pandemic; that makes sense. But then when you start doing it for cancer drugs that are really expensive or the insulin because people need it to live? That sort of thing.

**Speights**: I think it could be. I don't think it will be. The Biden administration is caving a little bit here, I think, to some pressure from within the Democratic Party. I don't think they would be -- I'm thinking any presidential administration in the U.S. -- wouldn't be in favor of just nearly [laughs] willy-nilly taking away patent rights. I think they realize that would undermine the foundation of our whole structure of drug development and that it would cause a lot more problems than it would solve. Maybe I'm being too optimistic there, Brian. I don't know about what you think, but I just don't think that's going to happen.

**Orelli**: Yeah. I guess it just depends on the state of the Congress and who's the president. I think right now, we're so divided that I don't think anything will get through Congress in its current state and probably in its future state. I think you're right, but I do worry about setting up a precedent. Although I think we've already had this one. They waved the patent rights on HIV drugs, and that didn't cause a major storm of inactivating patents over the last 20 years or however long its been since they did it. I think we're probably OK, but I just wanted to bring that up as a point.

**Speights**: Yeah. Personally, I don't think it's a good move. I think it's better to respect all intellectual-property rights and come up with a better solution. I do agree that more vaccines need to be made available to Third World countries and developing nations. I think there's probably a better way.

**Orelli**: Yeah. I think they're just letting the companies ramp up their production. Moderna is looking at 3 billion doses next year. I think that if we just let them go on [laughs] their own and maybe even support them financially, I think that should be sufficient to get us where we need to be.

### CP – Advantage

#### States should add more stringent requirements for filing secondary patents for medicines as outlined by 1NC Newsome

#### Requirements:

* Utility requirement through increased efficacy
* Proven improvement
* Medicinal mechanism

Newsome 17, A [(JD candidate George Washington School of Law). (2017). Side effects of evergreening may include decreased competition & increased prices in the pharmaceutical industry. AIPLA Quarterly Journal, 45(4), 791-822] Justin

The current framework for evaluating a patent application, particularly the requirements of utility and nonobviousness, is insufficient for evaluating whether a secondary patent should be issued for a drug. Given that courts are tied to the low bar for utility and inconsistent with their application of nonobviousness,1 04 it is necessary to pass legislation creating a new utility requirement tailored to secondary pharmaceutical patents. This Note's Author proposes legislation language as follows: 35 U.S.C. § 106: Patentable Pharmaceutical Inventions

(a) Utility requirement for secondary patent: In the case of a pharmaceutical invention claiming an improvement on a patented invention, the applicant shall demonstrate through clear and convincing evidence in the written description that such invention has increased efficacy as compared to the original.

(b) Increased efficacy defined: As used in part (a), "increased efficacy" refers to a proven improvement in the mechanism of action, as disclosed in the patent claims. 0 5

(c) Mechanism of action defined: As used in part (b), "mechanism of action" refers to the process by which a drug functions to produce a therapeutic effect, as disclosed in the patent claims. 06

Under this legislation, the USPTO could grant a secondary patent only if the new formula's mechanism of action, or production of the intended pharmacological effect, in fact improves upon the patented drug's mechanism of action. For example, because VidaDrug is a chemotherapy drug, the new formula must include a change in the mechanism of action which causes an improvement in the efficacy of the drug's tumor-shrinking abilities to be eligible for a secondary patent. A formula tweak that reduces side effects is insufficient, because the underlying purpose of the drug - to treat cancer - remains unaffected.

#### Solves innovation

Newsome 17, A [(JD candidate George Washington School of Law). (2017). Side effects of evergreening may include decreased competition & increased prices in the pharmaceutical industry. AIPLA Quarterly Journal, 45(4), 791-822] Justin

Pharmaceutical patents are inherently different from software or manufacturing patents. 144 Pharmaceutical companies create life-saving drugs that carry a very serious benefit for a vulnerable group of consumers - patients. Because of this, the pharmaceutical industry should be held to a higher standard if its companies seek to prohibit affordable generic drugs from coming to the marketplace.

1. An Efficacy-Focused Standard Will Motivate Pharmaceutical Companies to Channel Resources to Creating Real Innovation Pharmaceutical companies argue that patent-life-cycle-management strategies (their preferred name for those tactics described herein as evergreening) are essential to ensuring they recoup R&D costs. 145 However, creation of a standard such as the one proposed here would ensure that pharmaceutical companies are properly incentivized to channel R&D resources to creating measurable change in the drugs, rather than creating minor changes that prolong the time they can profit off of monopolies at the expense of patients. For those industries in which R&D is more productive, like the pharmaceutical industry, "patent procedures should be refined to tighten the relationship between patents and the underlying inventions."14 6
2. A Higher Standard for Secondary Pharmaceutical Patents Will Increase Competition & Lead to Lower Prices The patent system enables pharmaceutical companies to retain market exclusivity for their drugs, allowing them to set high prices without an eye toward competition.1 47 The companies cite the need to recoup R&D costs as the driving factor for their pricing decisions,148 but critics say their main motivation is making a profit.'49 While the pharmaceutical companies' argument may hold weight, high prices for drugs have a negative impact on those patients who need those drugs, but cannot afford them.150 Tightening patent laws to prevent pharmaceutical companies from retaining patent protection for minor changes in their patented drugs will allow other companies to enter the marketplace sooner and drive prices down through competition. 5

### DA – Infrastructure

#### Infrastructure passes now but political capital is key

News West 9/8 [News West. September 8, 2021. “Biden’s bipartisan bet on infrastructure has paid off so far” <https://newswest.org/bidens-bipartisan-bet-on-infrastructure-has-paid-off-so-far/> Accessed 9/13 //gord0]

Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell has said he is “100%” focused on stopping President Biden’s agenda — and yet he voted with every Senate Democrat last week to set the stage for passing a bipartisan infrastructure bill that would be a major political win for the White House.

He wasn’t alone. Sixteen other Republicans opted to advance the legislation — in the face of multiple missives from former President Trump urging them to block it.

At a moment of such intense partisanship, this momentary alignment of incentives for Democrats and Republicans, set to vote in the coming days to pass the approximately $1-trillion package out of the Senate, is the Washington equivalent of a total eclipse. However rare and fleeting, Republicans and Democrats believe they are serving their own self-interests, not just the president’s, in voting to pass a bipartisan bill to improve roads, bridges, rail lines, water pipes and broadband networks.

“Every incumbent benefits from the sense that the Congress can figure out how to get important things done,” said Sen. Roy Blunt (R-Mo.).

Unsurprisingly, lawmakers don’t expect the conviviality to last long.

Upon passing the bipartisan plan as soon as this weekend, Democrats hope to soon approve the framework for a second bill, a sweeping Democratic proposal that includes [massive subsidies and tax breaks for working families](https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2021-04-28/biden-families-plan-taxes-rich-to-cover-child-care-job-leave-community-college-and-more), free preschool and community college, a large expansion of Medicare and other tax cuts. Knowing no Republicans will support that measure, Democrats plan to utilize a process known as reconciliation, which requires just 50 votes for passage.

After Trump failed to achieve infrastructure legislation — his repeated efforts to promote “Infrastructure Week” became a running Washington joke — Biden has sought to leverage his 36 years of experience in the Senate to pursue a [domestic program modeled after President Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal](https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2021-03-10/bidens-early-win-on-covid-relief-could-be-hard-to-repeat-or-he-could-be-fdr).

Taking office amid the COVID-19 pandemic, Biden and Democrats brushed aside Republican opposition in March to enact a $1.9-trillion relief bill. But the decision to pivot to infrastructure, according to multiple administration officials, was based on a view that legislation focused on economic recovery was the logical next step and provided Biden an opportunity to notch a bipartisan achievement.

“The president always felt like this is a bill that’s going to get Republican support because these are issues that have always been bipartisan,” said Anita Dunn, counselor to the president, in an interview. “We haven’t had a major infrastructure bill in this country for a long time, and there’s desperate need for it.”

President Obama, who provoked strong reactions from the GOP base, exhausted precious political capital in his first two years in office on a more ideological push for healthcare reform. Conversely, [Republicans have struggled to negatively define Biden](https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2021-02-05/while-biden-pushes-crisis-response-republicans-go-to-war-with-themselves), and his prioritization of infrastructure legislation has maintained broad public support and generated little political backlash.

“It’s not like we’re asking people to vote for unpopular things,” Dunn said. “We’re asking them to vote for popular things.”

Seven in 10 Americans back the bipartisan infrastructure proposal, according to a Monmouth University [poll](https://www.monmouth.edu/polling-institute/reports/monmouthpoll_us_072921/) that the White House cited in a memo to lawmakers this week. The initiative also has the backing of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other trade groups, as well as the country’s largest labor unions.

With both parties looking ahead at the 2022 midterm election that will decide control of Congress, several Republicans have calculated there’s more risk in outright obstinacy than occasionally meeting the president in the middle.

“If you’re a Republican, you want to prove that you’re not just here to completely block and stop the entire agenda,” said Sen. John Thune of South Dakota, the No. 2 Republican in the Senate. “It’d be good maybe for the administration and they probably need a win right about now, but I also think that there are benefits politically to members on both sides.”

Biden’s push for bipartisan legislation has required persistence, flexibility and legislative acrobatics. After talks with Republicans faltered in early June, Biden encouraged his team to engage with a bipartisan group of senators drawing up their own infrastructure plan. After [agreeing to a basic framework](https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2021-06-24/infrastructure-deal-bipartisan-tentative-congress), Biden nearly torpedoed the effort by saying he wouldn’t sign it until Democrats passed their own companion bill — a likely $3.5-trillion package through the budget reconciliation process.

Though [Biden quickly walked back that comment](https://www.latimes.com/world-nation/story/2021-06-27/bipartisan-infrastructure-deal-back-on-track-after-walk-back), his blunt assertion underlined his pursuit of a two-track approach that has proven — so far— to be politically shrewd.

The two bills, in theory, placate both ends of the president’s party: moderates craving a return to bipartisan deal-making and progressives eager to enact a broader agenda — giving Democrats, as some Republicans have argued, a chance to have it both ways.

“If you can get major legislation through with support from both parties, in Washington right now, that is a major accomplishment,” said Mike DuHaime, a GOP strategist in New Jersey. “He’s giving cover to a lot of Democrats in swing districts who need it.And it does give him freedom to go in a more partisan direction on other things.”

But the bifurcated approach also benefits Republicans. By backing the bipartisan bill, they can showcase a willingness to work with a Democratic administration to advance shared goals, while vehemently opposing the Democrats’ second bill, a release valve for the partisan steam that animates the party’s base.

“For Republicans, it’s a two-fer,” said Whit Ayres, a GOP pollster. “There’s lots to like in both positions.”

Sen. Kevin Cramer (R-N.D.), who has supported the bipartisan bill while opposing the Democrats’ reconciliation measure, is OK giving the president a bipartisan “win,” believing GOP lawmakers will benefit from delivering their voters long-needed improvements and projects.

“Not every transaction requires a winner and a loser,” Cramer said. “Some transactions can have winners on both sides. I think infrastructure along with national defense are the policy issues that provide opportunities for us to do the right thing.”

Republicans also feel confident that any bipartisan credit Biden receives from the deal will come crashing down when Democrats turn to the partisan proposal.

#### The plan decks PC that could be used on infrastructure – tradeoffs and negotiations

Bhadrakumar 5/11 [M.K. Bhadrakumar is a former Indian diplomat*.* May 11, 2021. “[Why Biden’s Vaccine IP Waiver is Political Theatre](https://www.counterpunch.org/2021/05/11/why-bidens-vaccine-ip-waiver-is-political-theatre/)” <https://www.counterpunch.org/2021/05/11/why-bidens-vaccine-ip-waiver-is-political-theatre/> Accessed 8/27 //gord0]

India’s Ministry of External Affairs has [welcomed](https://www.mea.gov.in/press-releases.htm?dtl/33848/Statement_on_the_US_support_for_TRIPS_Waiver) the statement of the US government of 5th May announcing their support for a relaxation in the norms of the agreement on TRIPS, to ensure quick and affordable access to vaccines and medicines for developing countries. Delhi is “hopeful that with a consensus based approach, the waiver can be approved quickly at the WTO.” But is the optimism warranted? The [US statement](https://ustr.gov/about-us/policy-offices/press-office/press-releases/2021/may/statement-ambassador-katherine-tai-covid-19-trips-waiver) itself is cautiously worded and is non-committal. It only says, “We will actively participate in text-based negotiations at the World Trade Organization (WTO) needed to make that happen. Those negotiations will take time given the consensus-based nature of the institution and the complexity of the issues involved.” The Biden administration’s emphasis continues to be on “our vaccine supply for the American people.” It is an America First strategy. President Biden has plans to at least partially vaccinate 70% of adults by July 4 so that herd immunity develops that will help the level of new infections to drop. Biden’s decision on the TRIPS waiver can only be seen as a political decision. A Reuters report says citing informed sources, “Wednesday’s decision allows Washington to be responsive to the demands of the (American) left and developing countries, while using WTO negotiations to narrow the scope of the waiver. Since the negotiations will take time, the decision also buys time to boost vaccine supplies through more conventional means.” In effect, the Biden Administration is juggling several balls in the air. On the one hand, the progressive left in the US politics, including Sen. Bernie Sanders and Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez in the Democratic Party, has been demanding TRIPS waiver for Covid vaccines; equally, developing countries, supported by the WHO and the UN, are also demanding the waiver; India, a key Indo-Pacific ally of the US, was the initiator of the proposal on TRIPS waiver back in December; and, in principle, Biden Administration is committed to “multilateralism.” On the other hand, Biden whose political life of half a century was largely spent in the US Congress, is well aware of the awesome clout of the pharmaceutical companies in American politics. From that lobby’s perspective, the patent waiver “amounts to the expropriation of the property of the pharmaceutical companies whose innovation and financial investments made the development of Covid-19 vaccines possible in the first place,” as a senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security puts it. The US pharmaceutical industry and congressional Republicans have already [gone on the offensive](https://www.newsweek.com/waiving-intellectual-property-protection-what-could-go-wrong-opinion-1589273) blasting Biden’s announcement saying it undermines incentives for American innovation. Besides, the argument goes, even with the patent waiver, vaccine manufacturing is a complex process and is not like simply flipping a switch. Sen. Richard Burr, the top Republican on the US Senate Health Committee, has denounced Biden’s decision: “Intellectual property protections are part of the reason we have these life-saving products; stripping these protections only ensures we won’t have the vaccines or treatments we need when the next pandemic occurs.” The Republican senators backed by Republican Study Committee Chairman Jim Banks propose to introduce legislation to block the move. Clearly, Biden would rather spend his political capital on getting the necessary legislation through the Congress to advance his domestic reform agenda rather than spend time and energy to take on the pharmaceutical industry to burnish his image as a good Samaritan on the world stage. Conceivably, Biden could be counting on the “text-based negotiations” at the WTO dragging on for months, if not years, without reaching anywhere. The US support for the waiver could even be a tactic to convince pharmaceutical firms to back less drastic steps like sharing technology and expanding joint ventures to quickly boost global production. So far Covid-19 vaccines have been distributed primarily to the wealthy countries that developed them, while the pandemic sweeps through poorer ones, such as India and the real goal is, after all, expanded vaccine distribution. Biden is well aware that there will be huge opposition to the TRIPS waiver from the US’ European allies as well. The British press has reported that the UK has been in closed-door talks at the World Trade Organization in recent months along with the likes of Australia, Canada, Japan, Norway, Singapore, the European Union and the US, who all opposed the idea.

#### Bill key to prevent infrastructure disaster from Grid Collapse

PPG, 3/4/2021 (MAR 4, 2021 9:00 PM, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette Editorial Board. Invest in infrastructure. March 4, 2021. <https://www.post-gazette.com/opinion/editorials/2021/03/05/Invest-in-infrastructure/stories/202102270028>, recut by JMP)

Now is the time for a reckoning, a realization: While it’s important to study the past to avoid repeating the same mistakes, the country must also look to its future and see the obvious — that America’s infrastructure as a whole needs some serious upkeep.

Democrats and Republicans alike have flirted with the idea of a sweeping infrastructure bill in recent years, and President Joe Biden’s team is working to outline such legislation. These efforts should proceed swiftly — now is the time for Congress to invest in infrastructure, not only to help prevent crises, but also to jump-start an economy mired in the coronavirus pandemic.

Despite being one of the richest countries in the world, the U.S. seems constantly to hover on the edge of disaster, with news of natural forces smashing through power grids and levies and fire prevention strategies on a yearly or monthly basis. Texas is only the most recent state to have been pushed over the edge.

The American Society of Civil Engineers just this week gave America’s infrastructure an overall grade of C-minus in its quadrennial report card. The last grade was D-plus and that report cited decades of underfunding and unheeded recommendations. C-minus is an improvement but deserves not just federal attention but actual intervention. The report notes “we are heading in the right direction, but a lot of work remains.”

There is opportunity in the recent economic and environmental devastation that grabs headlines and breaks hearts. In the aftermath of the Great Depression, the government put millions to work improving parks and building roads and bridges and airports. President Dwight Eisenhower’s interstate highway system remains the life veins of interstate travel.

A new and vigorous infrastructure package for America would fix what needs to be fixed and offer the promise of an economic boon.

The purpose of the federal government is to address the needs of American society in a way that can’t be tackled by states in a piecemeal fashion. What has happened in recent days within The Lone Star State demonstrates keenly that this is the time — actually past the time — that our federal leaders must shore up the foundations of our federation. Congress should act swiftly to lead states in reversing the entropy chewing away at America’s foundations. Until this happens, society stands on shifting sands.

#### Grid collapse causes extinction.

Greene ’19 [Sherrell R.; Nuclear Engineering M.S. degrees from the University of Tennessee, recognized subject matter expert in nuclear reactor safety, nuclear fuel cycle technologies, and advanced reactor concept development, worked at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) for over three decades, as Director of Research Reactor Development Programs and Director of Nuclear Technology Programs; “Enhancing Electric Grid, Critical Infrastructure, and Societal Resilience with Resilient Nuclear Power Plants (rNPPs),” Nuclear Technology 205(3), <https://ans.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00295450.2018.1505357?needAccess=true> recut gord0]

There are a variety of events that could deal ~~crippling~~ blows to a nation’s Grid, Critical Infrastructure, and social fabric. The types of catastrophes under consideration here are “very bad day” scenarios that might result from severe GMDs induced by solar CMEs, HEMP attacks, cyber attacks, etc.5

As briefly discussed in Sec. III.C, the probability of a GMD of the magnitude of the 1859 Carrington Event is now believed to be on the order of 1%/year. The Earth narrowly missed (by only several days) intercepting a CME stream in July 2012 that would have created a GMD equal to or larger than the Carrington Event.41 Lloyd’s, in its 2013 report, “Solar Storm Risk to the North American Electric Grid,” 42 stated the following: “A Carrington-level, extreme geomagnetic storm is almost inevitable in the future…The total U.S. population at risk of extended power outage from a Carrington-level storm is between 20-40 million, with durations of 16 days to 1-2 years…The total economic cost for such a scenario is estimated at $0.6-2.6 trillion USD.” Analyses conducted subsequent to the Lloyd’s assessment indicated the geographical area impacted by the CME would be larger than that estimated in Lloyd’s analysis (extending farther northward along the New England coast of the United States and in the state of Minnesota),43 and that the actual consequences of such an event could actually be greater than estimated by Lloyd’s.

Based on “Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack: Critical National Infrastructures” to Congress in 2008 (Ref. 39), a HEMP attack over the Central U.S. could impact virtually the entire North American continent. The consequences of such an event are difficult to quantify with confidence. Experts affiliated with the aforementioned Commission and others familiar with the details of the Commission’s work have stated in Congressional testimony that such an event could “kill up to 90 percent of the national population through starvation, disease, and societal collapse.” 44,45 Most of these consequences are either direct or indirect impacts of the predicted collapse of virtually the entire U.S. Critical Infrastructure system in the wake of the attack.

Last, recent analyses by both the U.S. Department of Energy46 and the U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine47 have concluded that cyber threats to the U.S. Grid from both state-level and substatelevel entities are likely to grow in number and sophistication in the coming years, posing a growing threat to the U.S. Grid.

These three “very bad day” scenarios are not creations of overzealous science fiction writers. A variety of mitigating actions to reduce both the vulnerability and the consequences of these events has been identified, and some are being implemented. However, the fact remains that events such as those described here have the potential to change life as we know it in the United States and other developed nations in the 21st century, whether the events occur individually, or simultaneously, and with or without coordinated physical attacks on Critical Infrastructure assets.

### 1NC – DA

#### Biotech R&D is set for high growth and investment now

NASDAQ 8/9 [NASDAQ is a stock market index that includes almost all stocks listed on the Nasdaq stock exchange. Along with the Dow Jones Industrial Average and S&P 500, it is one of the three most-followed stock market indices in the United States. This article was written by NASDAQ contributors and published on CNBC. The editorial staff of CNBC did not contribute to the creation of this study.) “Why the Nasdaq Biotechnology Index is poised for a run of sustainable growth” CNBC, NASDAQ, 8/9/2021, <https://www.cnbc.com/advertorial/2021/08/09/why-the-nasdaq-biotechnology-index-is-poised-for-a-run-of-sustainable-growth-.html>] RM

Between the recent bio innovation success stories in the battle against Covid-19 and the technology-driven advances ushering in new efficiencies for research and development (R&D), **the biotech industry has never been more relevant**.

As home to more than 265 companies, the pioneering Nasdaq Biotechnology Index (NBI) has long been committed to providing healthcare’s innovators with access to the capital they need to keep moving forward. Now, investors have access to the Index’s companies through a new ETF, the Invesco Nasdaq Biotechnology ETF (IBBQ).

Launched in 1993, in the wake of the original “biotech revolution” led by the discovery of recombinant DNA, NBI® remains the most representative index in the space. In fact, 98% of all U.S. listed biotech companies are listed on Nasdaq. When considering the massive growth taking place in the sector, it’s no surprise that NBI has outperformed both the S&P 500 (SPX) and Health Care Select Sector Index (IXVTR) in certain market environments.

According to Mark Marex, Index R&D Senior Specialist for Nasdaq who recently compiled an in-depth report on the NBI, global events and digital acceleration have contributed to the Index’s recent strong performance; and Nasdaq’s dedication to maintaining a true benchmark for technology-driven healthcare innovation has provided a framework for growth.

Building the ideal benchmark

Given the existence of pureplay biotech firms, hybrid biopharmaceutical companies, and less R&D-intensive pharmaceutical manufacturers, creating a single benchmark that truly captures the biotech sector and the symbiotic relationships among its players is no easy task.

One of the unique aspects of NBI, versus biotech-focused indexes created by other index providers, is its subsector classifications split between Biotechnology and Pharmaceuticals. As of June 30, 2021, ICB (FTSE Russell’s Industry Classification Benchmark) classified 222 NBI companies as Biotechnology and 47 as Pharmaceuticals. The resulting split by index weight is approximately 65% and 35%, respectively, which illustrates the major difference between the two groups: Pharmaceutical companies tend to be much larger than Biotechnology firms.

This split within a single index provides advantages for investors: While offering some exposure to more established pharmaceutical companies, it also includes R&D-heavy biotech firms that over time may transition into biotech-driven pharma companies. That’s exactly what happened this year when NBI’s largest company, Amgen (AMGN / $144Bn), was reclassified by ICB from Biotechnology to Pharmaceuticals. By retaining firms as they straddle the two classifications over the course of their lifecycle, NBI presents potential growth advantages when compared with index providers that focus rigidly on one classification versus the other.

Home to world-changing breakthroughs

Nasdaq’s vision for the Index has served it well, **both in terms of its longevity and its current role as a champion of the companies paving the way for a post-pandemic world through their technological advances and life-saving treatments**. The broad reach of NBI constituents across multiple fronts in the fight against Covid-19, for example — from diagnosis to vaccines and treatment —demonstrates the strength of its core approach.

NBI companies including Gilead and Regeneron made headlines for their successes during the pandemic with antiviral therapeutics and antibody-based therapeutics for high-risk patients. But it’s the stunning success of m-RNA vaccine technology from Moderna and BioNTech, two NBI companies, that most clearly showcase the home run potential among the biotech entrepreneurs in the space.

And while NBI is currently up 8.2% YTD on a price-return basis (as of June 30) **versus a broader market gain of 14.4% by SPX**, the S&P Biotechnology Select Industry Index (SPSIBI) is down 3.7%.

It’s worth noting that in 2020, NBI outperformed SPX with a price gain of 25.7% versus 16.3%, respectively. This shows the resilience of the NBI and the inherent strength of its current mix of companies.

The possibilities of accelerated R&D

As a whole, the life-changing work being done by NBI constituents requires enormous amounts of R&D. In 2020, R&D expenses for the entire group totaled $68.5Bn, nearly 31% of these companies’ revenue totals. Two-thirds of NBI’s firms reported R&D expenses that exceeded their revenues

For several NBI companies, however, these massive investments provided tangible benefits in the fight against Covid-19. Undoubtedly, years of back-end work and minimal profits ultimately helped deliver the very products that are now driving historic returns. Psychologically, their breakthroughs demonstrated the enormous potential of science and technology to serve humankind.

Looking ahead, **revolutions in Mapping and Engineering processes, boosted by rapid advancements in Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence, are fostering a true fusion of Biology and Technology that could transform the traditionally costly and labor-intensive R&D function**. Some research estimates these advances could reduce the failure rate of drugs by up to 45% and shorten drug trials by up to 50%. The result could be even more breakthroughs, performed much more efficiently, greatly increasing the returns on biopharmaceutical R&D.

Even a conservative interpretation of the above numbers would significantly reduce R&D costs and boost the market capitalization of therapeutics companies from the current $2Tn up to $9Tn as soon as 2024, according to estimates from ARK Financial.

Meanwhile, increasingly cost-effective human genomics could revolutionize several other industries, from agriculture to biofuels.

By any measure, there is much to be excited about across the spectrum of biotech — especially coming out of a global pandemic. And while no person, nor index, can truly predict what the future holds, chances are strong that companies sitting within NBI will have a hand in leading the way.

“**For investors**, the Index already serves as a fascinating lens through which to view human society’s scientific and technological advancements,” says Mark Marex. “To me, it’s very exciting to ponder what the researchers, scientists, and business leaders in this space will accomplish next.”

#### IPR protections are key to sustain healthcare investments and manufacturing. Independently, it’s key to broader vaccine production.

Roberts 6/25/21 [James M. Roberts is a Research Fellow for Economic Freedom and Growth at the Heritage Foundation. Roberts' primary responsibility as one of The Heritage Foundation's lead experts in economic freedom and growth is to edit the Rule of Law and Monetary Freedom sections of [Index of Economic Freedom](https://www.heritage.org/index/). An influential annual analysis of the economic climate of countries throughout the world, the Index is co-published by Heritage and The Wall Street Journal.) “Biden’s OK of Global Theft of America’s Intellectual Property is Wrong, Dangerous.” 6/25/2021, The Heritage Foundation, Commentary—Public Health] RM

Last month, President Biden advocated removing international intellectual property rights (IPR) protections for American-made COVID-19 vaccines.

**Foreign companies may take the president’s policy as a green light to produce reverse-engineered, counterfeit substitutes**.

The best way to prevent and treat new diseases is to ensure that private American pharmaceutical companies continue their innovative research and vaccine production.

Three U.S. companies—Pfizer, Moderna, and Johnson & Johnson—created and manufactured the world’s most effective mRNA COVID vaccines in record time. An increasing majority of Americans have now been inoculated, but much of the developing world remains in desperate need of vaccines. Americans naturally want to help. The question is how.

Last month, President Biden advocated removing international intellectual property rights (IPR) protections for American-made COVID-19 vaccines. This, he said, would help make the vaccines more plentiful and available in needy countries. **It’s a short-sighted approach and doomed to fail.**

Mr. Biden wants to waive the World Trade Organization’s “Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights” (TRIPS) agreement for U.S. vaccines and let foreign countries issue “compulsory licenses“ allowing their domestic pharmaceutical companies to manufacture the medicines without adequately compensating the companies that invented them.

Practically speaking, countries such as India and South Africa are unlikely to manufacture the vaccines. They lack an advanced infrastructure for cold supply-chain distribution and many other crucial resources required by these products’ capital-intensive, state-of-the-art manufacturing process.

But the Biden policy is bad for many other reasons.

Developing breakthrough medications takes tremendous ingenuity and immense financial investments. **It’s an extraordinarily high-risk endeavor, and the prospect of making a profit is what convinces private companies to undertake those risks.**

Signaling that the United States will not fight to defend their intellectual property rights **actively undermines innovation and manufacturing** in American health care and medicines.

It also erodes patient protections by undermining quality control. Foreign companies may take the president’s policy as a green light to produce reverse-engineered, counterfeit substitutes. Already there are reports of ineffective and even dangerous counterfeit COVID-19 vaccines being sold around the world.

Those pushing to break U.S. pharmaceutical patents say they want to do so for altruistic reasons. Consequently, they also insist that the prices for the medications be set far below their actual value.

But history shows us that forcing private companies to provide vaccines at an “affordable price,” regardless of the cost to the companies, actually impedes the manufacture of high-quality vaccines. Moreover, it inhibits the **future development of vaccines** needed to meet as-yet-unknown diseases.

Washington first imposed vaccine price controls as part of Hillary Clinton’s 1993 healthcare-for-all crusade. As the Wall Street Journal later noted, it was a body blow to the U.S. vaccine industry. Ironically, government-decreed prices left the companies unable to produce enough vaccines to meet Mrs. Clinton’s admittedly admirable goal of universal immunization of children. Since then, U.S. firms have largely eschewed the vaccine market because they could not recoup their R&D and manufacturing costs and earn enough profit to fund future innovation.

Ultimately, **compulsory licensing legalizes the theft of intellectual property**. Recognizing this, senators from both sides of the aisle have joined with other government officials and industry leaders to call on the administration to reverse this bad decision.

The U.S. patent protection system has served the nation well since its founding.  **It is and has been a bulwark of American prosperity**, but the strength of that protection has been weakening in the past few decades. **Compulsory licensing contributes to the erosion** of that protection.

As the U.S. and the rest of the world emerge from the pandemic, it is clear that more innovative medicines and vaccines will be needed for future protection from viruses and other emerging biological threats.

**The best way to prevent and treat those new diseases is to ensure that private American pharmaceutical companies continue their innovative research and vaccine production**.

That way, U.S.-manufactured vaccines can be made available to all Americans quickly. And governments can subsidize their export and sale to other countries far more effectively and less expensively than through compulsory licensing schemes.

Meanwhile, let’s hope Mr. Biden listens to the more reasonable and less-agenda driven voices in this debate and reverses course on the TRIPS waiver.

#### COVID was a precursor to deadlier pandemics—vaccine production will determine everything.

Lander 8/4/21 [Eric Lander, President Biden’s Science Advisory and Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy) “Opinion: As bad as Covid-19 has been, a future pandemic could be even worse—unless we act now” 8/4/21, The Washington Post] RM

[Coronavirus](https://www.washingtonpost.com/coronavirus/?itid=lk_inline_manual_3) vaccines can end the current pandemic if enough people choose to protect themselves and their loved ones by getting vaccinated. But in the years to come, we will still need to defend against a pandemic side effect: collective amnesia.

As public health emergencies recede, societies often quickly forget their experiences — and **fail to prepare for future challenges**. For pandemics, such a course would be disastrous.

**New infectious diseases have been emerging at an accelerating pace,** and they are spreading faster.

Our federal government is responsible for defending the United States against future threats. That’s why President Biden has asked Congress to fund his plan to build on current scientific progress to keep new infectious-disease threats from turning into pandemics like covid-19.

As the president’s science adviser, I know what’s becoming possible. For the first time in our history, we have an opportunity not just to refill our stockpiles but also to transform our capabilities. However, **if we don’t start preparing now for future pandemics, the window for action will close.**

Covid-19 has been a catastrophe: The toll in the United States alone is [more than 614,000 lives](https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2020/national/coronavirus-us-cases-deaths/?itid=lk_inline_manual_11) and has been estimated to exceed [$16 trillion](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2771764), with disproportionate impact on vulnerable and marginalized communities.

But a future pandemic could be even worse — unless we take steps now.

It’s important to remember that the virus behind covid-19 is far less deadly than the 1918 influenza. The virus also belongs to a well-understood family, coronaviruses. It was possible to design vaccines within days of knowing the virus’s genetic code because 20 years of [basic scientific research](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/372/6538/109.full) had revealed which protein to target and how to stabilize it. And while the current virus spins off variants, its mutation rate is slower than that of most viruses.

**Unfortunately, most of the 26 families of viruses that infect humans are less well understood or harder to control**. We have a great deal of work still ahead.

The development of [mRNA vaccine technology](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2020/12/06/covid-vaccine-messenger-rna/?itid=lk_inline_manual_17) — thanks to more than a decade of foresighted basic research — was a game-changer. It shortened the time needed to design and test vaccines to less than a year — far faster than for any previous vaccine. And it’s been surprisingly effective against covid-19.

Still, there’s much more to do. We don’t yet know how mRNA vaccines will perform against other viruses down the road. And **when the next pandemic breaks out, we’ll want to be able to respond even faster.**

Fortunately, the scientific community has been developing a bold plan to keep future viruses from becoming pandemics.

Here are a few of the goals we should shoot for:

The capability to design, test and approve safe and effective vaccines within 100 days of detecting a pandemic threat (for covid-19, that would have meant May 2020); manufacture enough doses to supply the world within 200 days; and speed vaccination campaigns by replacing sterile injections with skin patches.

Diagnostics simple and cheap enough for daily home testing to limit spread and target medical care.

Early-warning systems to spot new biological threats anywhere in the world soon after they emerge and monitor them thereafter.

We desperately need to strengthen our public health system — from expanding the workforce to modernizing labs and data systems — including to ensure that vulnerable populations are protected.

And we need to coordinate actions with our international partners, because pandemics know no borders.

These goals are ambitious, but they’re feasible — provided the work is managed with the seriousness, focus and accountability of NASA’s Apollo Program, which sent humans to the moon.

Importantly, these capabilities won’t just prepare us for future pandemics; they’ll also improve public health and medical care for infectious diseases today.

Preparing for threats is a core national responsibility. That’s why our government invests heavily in missile defense and counterterrorism. We need to similarly protect the nation against biological threats, which range from the ongoing risk of pandemics to the possibility of deliberate use of bioweapons.

Pandemics cause massive death and disruption. From a financial standpoint, they’re also astronomically expensive. If, as might be expected from [history](https://www.cfr.org/timeline/major-epidemics-modern-era) and current trends, we suffered a pandemic of the current scale every two decades, the annualized cost would exceed $500 billion per year. Investing a much smaller amount to avert this toll is an economic and moral imperative.

The White House will put forward a detailed plan this month to ensure that the United States can fully prepare before the next outbreak. It’s hard to imagine a higher economic or human return on national investment.

#### Ecosystem sensitivity from climate change means future pandemics will cause extinction—assumes COVID

Supriya 4/19 [Lakshmi Supriya got her BSc in Industrial Chemistry from IIT Kharagpur (India) and a Ph.D. in Polymer Science and Engineering from Virginia Tech (USA). She has more than a decade of global industry experience working in the USA, Europe, and India. After her Ph.D., she worked as part of the R&D group in diverse industries starting with semiconductor packaging at Intel, Arizona, where she developed a new elastomeric thermal solution, which has now been commercialized and is used in the core i3 and i5 processors. From there she went on to work at two startups, one managing the microfluidics chip manufacturing lab at a biotechnology company and the other developing polymer formulations for oil extraction from oil sands. She also worked at Saint Gobain North America, developing various material solutions for photovoltaics and processing techniques and new applications for fluoropolymers. Most recently, she managed the Indian R&D team of Enthone (now part of MacDermid) developing electroplating technologies for precious metals.) “Humans versus viruses - Can we avoid extinction in near future?” News Medical Life Sciences, 4/19/21, https://www.news-medical.net/news/20210419/Humans-versus-viruses-Can-we-avoid-extinction-in-near-future.aspx] RM

Expert argues that human-caused changes to the environment can lead to the emergence of pathogens, not only from outside but also from our own microbiome, which can pave the way for large-scale destruction of humans and **even our extinction**.

Whenever there is a change in any system, it will cause other changes to reach a balance or equilibrium, generally at a point different from the original balance. Although this principle was originally posited by the French chemist Henry Le Chatelier for chemical reactions, this theory can be applied to almost anything else.

In an essay published on the online server Preprints\*, Eleftherios P. Diamandis of the University of Toronto and the Mount Sinai Hospital, Toronto, argues that changes caused by humans, to the climate, and everything around us will lead to changes that may have a dramatic impact on human life. Because our ecosystems are so complex, we don’t know how our actions will affect us in the long run, so humans generally disregard them.

Changing our environment

Everything around us is changing, from living organisms to the climate, water, and soil. Some estimates say about half the organisms that existed 50 years ago have already become extinct, and about 80% of the species may become extinct in the future.

As the debate on global warming continues, according to data, the last six years have been the warmest on record. Global warming is melting ice, and sea levels have been increasing. The changing climate is causing more and more wildfires, which are leading to other related damage. At the same time, increased flooding is causing large-scale devastation.

One question that arises is how much environmental damage have humans already done? A recent study compared the natural biomass on Earth to the mass produced by humans and found humans produce a mass equal to their weight every week. This human-made mass is mainly for buildings, roads, and plastic products.

In the early 1900s, human-made mass was about 3% of the global biomass. Today both are about equal. Projections say by 2040, the human-made mass will be triple that of Earth’s biomass. But, slowing down human activity that causes such production may be difficult, given it is considered part of our growth as a civilization.

Emerging pathogens

Although we are made up of human cells, we have almost ten times that of bacteria just in our guts and more on our skin. These microbes not only affect locally but also affect the entire body. There is a balance between the good and bad bacteria, and any change in the environment may cause this balance to shift, especially on the skin, the consequences of which are unknown.

Although most bacteria on and inside of us are harmless, gut bacteria can also have viruses. If viruses don’t kill the bacteria immediately, they can incorporate into the bacterial genome and stay latent for a long time until reactivation by environmental factors, when they can become pathogenic. They can also escape from the gut and enter other organs or the bloodstream. Bacteria can then use these viruses to kill other bacteria or help them evolve to more virulent strains.

An example of the evolution of pathogens is the cause of the current pandemic, the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Several mutations are now known that make the virus more infectious and resistant to immune responses, and strengthening its to enter cells via surface receptors.

The brain

There is evidence that the SARS-CoV-2 can also affect the brain. The virus may enter the brain via the olfactory tract or through the angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) pathway. Viruses can also affect our senses, such as a loss of smell and taste, and there could be other so far unkown neurological effects. The loss of smell seen in COVID-19 could be a new viral syndrome specific to this disease.

Many books and movies have described pandemics caused by pathogens that wipe out large populations and cause severe diseases. In the essay, the author provides a hypothetical scenario where a gut bacteria suddenly starts producing viral proteins. Some virions spread through the body and get transmitted through the human population. After a few months, the virus started causing blindness, and within a year, large populations lost their vision.

Pandemics can cause other diseases that can threaten humanity’s entire existence. **The COVID-19 pandemic brought this possibility to the forefront**. If we continue disturbing the equilibrium between us and the environment, we don’t know what the consequences may be and **the next pandemic could lead us to extinction.**

## Case

### General

#### Squo amendments solve, and more will come if it gets out of hand. Also, improvement inventions solve ALL of your offense because innovators can add to the developers creation. Evergreening doesn’t bypass that

Thomas 09 [Professor Thomas joined the Georgetown Law Center faculty in 2002. He has served as a Visiting Scholar at the Congressional Research Service for the past decade and was named the inaugural Thomas Alva Edison Visiting Scholar at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in 2011. He previously was a member of the faculty of the George Washington University Law School, and has served on the visiting faculties at Cornell Law School and the University of Tokyo. Professor Thomas formerly served as law clerk to Chief Judge Helen W. Nies of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; visiting fellow at the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and Comparative Patent, Copyright and Unfair Competition Law in Munich, Germany; and research scholar at the Institute of Intellectual Property in Tokyo, Japan. Professor Thomas has published numerous articles and six books on the subject of intellectual property law. Thomas has his B.S. at Carnegie Mellon, and his J.D. at the University of Michigan. November 13, 2009 “Patent “Evergreening”: Issues in Innovation and Competition”. <https://www.ipmall.info/sites/default/files/hosted_resources/crs/R40917_091113.pdf> //gord0]

“Patent evergreening” is a potentially perjorative term that generally refers to the strategy of obtaining multiple patents that cover different aspects of the same product, typically by obtaining patents on improved versions of existing products. Although the patent system allows improvement patents to be obtained in any industry, evergreening is said to be most common in the pharmaceutical industry. Some observers believe that the availability of so-called continuation applications at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) may promote evergreening practices. USPTO regulations that would have restricted the availability of continuation applications have been struck down by the courts on the grounds that the regulations exceeded the agency’s statutory authority to promulgate. Others believe that the Hatch-Waxman Act, specialized legislation that governs the resolution of patent disputes between brand-name and generic drug companies, may also encourage evergreening in the pharmaceutical industry. However, 2003 amendments to the Hatch-Waxman Act may have mitigated some of these concerns. Critics of evergreening assert that the ability to obtain multiple patents on a product, over a period of many years, effectively extends the term of exclusivity that the patent holder obtains. They further assert that this practice is abusive, impedes the introduction of generic medications, and has a negative effect upon public health in the United States. Other observers believe that the term “evergreening” is itself inappropriate. In their view, sound intellectual property policy allows innovators to obtain patents **on improvement inventions.** Most technological advance occurs incrementally, they observe, and many improvement patents cover advances that are of considerable practical significance to patients and other consumers. In addition, patents on improvements may not impede the ability of competitors to market products that were covered by expired patents on original technologies. Finally, the developer of the “original” product is not always the same entity as the developer of “improvement” technologies. The ability of any innovator to obtain a patent upon an improvement invention is said to promote competition. Should Congress conclude that the current situation is satisfactory, then no action need be taken. If Congress wishes to intervene, however, a number of options present themselves. Congress may wish to consider the regulation of continuation applications or the introduction of statutory provisions that more directly address the perceived problem of evergreening. In addition, more generalized reform of the patent system may address concerns over evergreening. Current bills before the 111th Congress would potentially introduce a broad range of reforms in an effort to improve the patent system, and would perhaps respond to criticisms of evergreening practices.

#### The purpose of evergreening is to make money—medical advances are direct effects of the money big pharma makes.

Collier 13

Roger Collier (consultant specializing in health care policy issues, CEO of national healthcare consulting firm, Principal-in-Charge off KPMG’s national health and welfare consulting practice); “Drug patents: the evergreening problem”; CMAJ Vol. 185, Issue 9; June 11, 2013; <https://www.cmaj.ca/content/185/9/E385/tab-e-letters>; EMJ

“Typically, when you evergreen something, you are not looking at any significant therapeutic advantage. You are looking at a company’s economic advantage,” says Dr. Joel Lexchin, a professor in the School of Health Policy and Management at York University in Toronto, Ontario. “The response from the brand side is that they are trying to protect their markets so they can further invest in R&D [research and development]. And even if they make a modification to a drug, doctors are still quite able to prescribe the generic version of the older product. Having said that, the brand-name companies put an awful lot of money into marketing the newer version, and that marketing is designed to affect what doctors do.” Evergreening has been a hot topic of late because of the recent ruling by India’s Supreme Court to refuse to grant Swiss pharmaceutical company Novartis a patent for a new version of its cancer drug Gleevec (imatinib mesylate), or Glivec, as it’s known in some countries. Novartis claims the drug is more easily absorbed into the blood and, considering it is used to fight leukemia, that is enough of an improvement to warrant patent protection. But India’s trade and industry minister, Anand Sharma, has defended the decision, and was quoted by Agence France-Presse as saying it was “absolutely justified under the law” and that India’s patent law “does not accept evergreening.”

### Superbugs/Pandemics

#### Plan can’t solve bacterial containment, education or social-organization and no warrant for ex risk – we read blue

Srivatsa ’17 (Kadiyali; specialist in pediatric intensive and critical care medicine in the UK. Invented the bacterial identification tool ‘MAYA’; 1-12-2017; "Superbug Pandemics and How to Prevent Them", American Interest; https://www.the-american-interest.com/2017/01/12/superbug-pandemics-and-how-to-prevent-them/, Accessed: 8-31-2021; AU)

It is by now no secret that the human species is locked in a race of its own making with “superbugs.” Indeed, if popular science fiction is a measure of awareness, the theme has pervaded English-language literature from Michael Crichton’s 1969 Andromeda Strain all the way to Emily St. John Mandel’s 2014 Station Eleven and beyond. By a combination of massive inadvertence and what can only be called stupidity, we must now invent new and effective antibiotics faster than deadly bacteria evolve—and regrettably, they are rapidly doing so with our help. I do not exclude the possibility that bad actors might deliberately engineer deadly superbugs.1 But even if that does not happen, humanity faces an existential threat largely of its own making in the absence of malign intentions. As threats go, this one is entirely predictable. The concept of a “black swan,” Nassim Nicholas Taleb’s term for low-probability but high-impact events, has become widely known in recent years. Taleb did not invent the concept; he only gave it a catchy name to help mainly business executives who know little of statistics or probability. Many have embraced the “black swan” label the way children embrace holiday gifts, which are often bobbles of little value, except to them. But the threat of inadvertent pandemics is not a “black swan” because its probability is not low. If one likes catchy labels, it better fits the term “gray rhino,” which, explains Michele Wucker, is a high-probability, high-impact event that people manage to ignore anyway for a raft of social-psychological reasons.2 A pandemic is a quintessential gray rhino, for it is no longer a matter of if but of when it will challenge us—and of how prepared we are to deal with it when it happens. We have certainly been warned. The curse we have created was understood as a possibility from the very outset, when seventy years ago Sir Alexander Fleming, the discoverer of penicillin, predicted antibiotic resistance. When interviewed for a 2015 article, “The Most Predictable Disaster in the History of the Human Race,” Bill Gates pointed out that one of the costliest disasters of the 20th century, worse even than World War I, was the Spanish Flu pandemic of 1918-19. As the author of the article, Ezra Klein, put it: “No one can say we weren’t warned. And warned. And warned. A pandemic disease is the most predictable catastrophe in the history of the human race, if only because it has happened to the human race so many, many times before.”3 Even with effective new medicines, if we can devise them, we must contain outbreaks of bacterial disease fast, lest they get out of control. In other words, we have a social-organizational challenge before us as well as a strictly medical one. That means getting sufficient amounts of medicine into the right hands and in the right places, but it also means educating people and enabling them to communicate with each other to prevent any outbreak from spreading widely. Responsible governments and cooperative organizations have options in that regard, but even individuals can contribute something. To that end, as a medical doctor I have created a computer app that promises to be useful in that regard—of which more in a moment. But first let us review the situation, for while it has become well known to many people, there is a general resistance to acknowledging the severity and imminence of the danger. What Are the Problems? Bacteria are among the oldest living things on the planet. They are masters of survival and can be found everywhere. Billions of them live on and in every one of us, many of them helping our bodies to run smoothly and stay healthy. Most bacteria that are not helpful to us are at least harmless, but some are not. They invade our cells, spread quickly, and cause havoc that we refer to generically as disease. Millions of people used to die every year as a result of bacterial infections, until we developed antibiotics. These wonder drugs revolutionized medicine, but one can have too much of a good thing. Doctors have used antibiotics recklessly, prescribing them for just about everything, and in the process helped to create strains of bacteria that are resistant to the medicines we have. We even give antibiotics to cattle that are not sick and use them to fatten chickens. Companies large and small still mindlessly market antimicrobial products for hands and home, claiming that they kill bacteria and viruses. They do more harm than good because the low concentrations of antimicrobials that these products contain tend to kill friendly bacteria (not viruses at all), and so clear the way for the mass multiplication of surviving unfriendly bacteria. Perhaps even worse, hospitals have deployed antimicrobial products on an industrial scale for a long time now, the result being a sharp rise in iatrogenic bacterial illnesses. Overuse of antibiotics and commercial products containing them has helped superbugs to evolve. We now increasingly face microorganisms that cannot be killed by antibiotics, antifungals, antivirals, or any other chemical weapon we throw at them. Pandemics are the major risk we run as a result, but it is not the only one. Overuse of antibiotics by doctors, homemakers, and hospital managers could mean that, in the not-too-distant future, something as simple as a minor cut could again become life-threatening if it becomes infected. Few non-medical professionals are aware that antibiotics are the foundation on which nearly all of modern medicine rests. Cancer therapy, organ transplants, surgeries minor and major, and even childbirth all rely on antibiotics to prevent infections. If infections become untreatable we stand to lose most of the medical advances we have made over the past fifty years.

#### No extinction from pandemics

* Death rates as high as 50% didn’t collapse civilization
* Fossil fuel record caps risk at .1% per century
* health, sanitation, medicine, science, public health bodies, solve
* viruses can’t survive in all locations
* refugee populations like tribes, remote researchers, submarine crews, solve

Ord 20 Ord, Toby. Toby David Godfrey Ord (born 18 July 1979) is an Australian philosopher. He founded Giving What We Can, an international society whose members pledge to donate at least 10% of their income to effective charities and is a key figure in the effective altruism movement, which promotes using reason and evidence to help the lives of others as much as possible.[3] He is a Senior Research Fellow at the University of Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, where his work is focused on existential risk. BA in Phil and Comp Sci from Melbourne, BPhil in Phil from Oxford, PhD in Phil from Oxford. The precipice: existential risk and the future of humanity. Hachette Books, 2020.

Are we safe now from events like this? Or are we more vulnerable? Could a pandemic threaten humanity’s future?10 The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In 541 CE the Plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine Empire. Over three years it took the lives of roughly 3 percent of the world’s people.11 When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of exchange, through diseases such as measles, influenza and especially smallpox. During the next hundred years a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll—one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the loss of more than 90 percent of the population of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower.12 And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. As a rough upper bound, the Columbian exchange may have killed as many as 10 percent of the world’s people.13 Centuries later, the world had become so interconnected that a truly global pandemic was possible. Near the end of the First World War, a devastating strain of influenza (known as the 1918 flu or Spanish Flu) spread to six continents, and even remote Pacific islands. At least a third of the world’s population were infected and 3 to 6 percent were killed.14 This death toll outstripped that of the First World War, and possibly both World Wars combined. Yet even events like these fall short of being a threat to humanity’s longterm potential.15 In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilization in the affected areas falter, but recover. The regional 25 to 50 percent death rate was not enough to precipitate a continent-wide collapse of civilization. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have altered the course of history substantially, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilization is likely to make it through future events with similar death rates, even if they were global in scale. The 1918 flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development despite its global reach. It looks like it was lost in the wake of the First World War, which despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history.16 It is less clear what lesson to draw from the Columbian exchange due to our lack of good records and its mix of causes. Pandemics were clearly a part of what led to a regional collapse of civilization, but we don’t know whether this would have occurred had it not been for the accompanying violence and imperial rule. The strongest case against existential risk from natural pandemics is the fossil record argument from Chapter 3. Extinction risk from natural causes above 0.1 percent per century is incompatible with the evidence of how long humanity and similar species have lasted. But this argument only works where the risk to humanity now is similar or lower than the longterm levels. For most risks this is clearly true, but not for pandemics. We have done many things to exacerbate the risk: some that could make pandemics more likely to occur, and some that could increase their damage. Thus even “natural” pandemics should be seen as a partly anthropogenic risk. Our population now is a thousand times greater than over most of human history, so there are vastly more opportunities for new human diseases to originate.17 And our farming practices have created vast numbers of animals living in unhealthy conditions within close proximity to humans. This increases the risk, as many major diseases originate in animals before crossing over to humans. Examples include HIV (chimpanzees), Ebola (bats), SARS (probably bats) and influenza (usually pigs or birds).18 Evidence suggests that diseases are crossing over into human populations from animals at an increasing rate.19 Modern civilization may also make it much easier for a pandemic to spread. The higher density of people living together in cities increases the number of people each of us may infect. Rapid long-distance transport greatly increases the distance pathogens can spread, reducing the degrees of separation between any two people. Moreover, we are no longer divided into isolated populations as we were for most of the last 10,000 years.20 Together these effects suggest that we might expect more new pandemics, for them to spread more quickly, and to reach a higher percentage of the world’s people. But we have also changed the world in ways that offer protection. We have a healthier population; improved sanitation and hygiene; preventative and curative medicine; and a scientific understanding of disease. Perhaps most importantly, we have public health bodies to facilitate global communication and coordination in the face of new outbreaks. We have seen the benefits of this protection through the dramatic decline of endemic infectious disease over the last century (though we can’t be sure pandemics will obey the same trend). Finally, we have spread to a range of locations and environments unprecedented for any mammalian species. This offers special protection from extinction events, because it requires the pathogen to be able to flourish in a vast range of environments and to reach exceptionally isolated populations such as uncontacted tribes, Antarctic researchers and nuclear submarine crews. 21 It is hard to know whether these combined effects have increased or decreased the existential risk from pandemics. This uncertainty is ultimately bad news: we were previously sitting on a powerful argument that the risk was tiny; now we are not. But note that we are not merely interested in the direction of the change, but also in the size of the change. If we take the fossil record as evidence that the risk was less than one in 2,000 per century, then to reach 1 percent per century the pandemic risk would need to be at least 20 times larger. This seems unlikely. In my view, the fossil record still provides a strong case against there being a high extinction risk from “natural” pandemics. So most of the remaining existential risk would come from the threat of permanent collapse: a pandemic severe enough to collapse civilization globally, combined with civilization turning out to be hard to re-establish or bad luck in our attempts to do so.

### Climate Change

#### No impact to warming, long timeframe, adaptation

Mendelsohn 15 Robert Mendelsohn is the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis **Professor at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies,** “Climate Change Demands We Change. Why Aren't We?: An Economic Perspective”, Social Research, Fall2015, Vol. 82 Issue 3, p727

The Benefits of Mitigation Are Modest and Delayed The popular literature on climate change is rife with claims that climate change is equivalent to an apocalypse. Whether climate change leads to an apocalypse depends on many factors, including no mitigation, no adaptation, and unlucky uncertain events. Probably the three most frightening images of climate change are tropical cyclones, floods, and droughts. Although all these events are likely to occur in a future climate, they are also an integral component of the current climate. We already have droughts, floods, and tropical cyclones. The question is, how will these things change? According to economic models of fossil fuel consumption, emissions of greenhouse gases are expected to double the concentrations of greenhouse gases from preindustrial levels of 275 part per million equivalent (ppme) to 550 ppme by 2040–2050. It will take more than another 100 years to double concentrations again to 1,100 ppme in the absence of mitigation. So despite the fact that fossil fuel consumption is causing a vast quantity of annual emissions, it takes a very long time for the concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere to double. According to climate models, a doubling of concentrations is expected to increase long-run average global temperature by 3°C, with a range between 1.5 and 4.5 degrees (IPCC 2014a). However, there is a long lag between an increase in concentrations and the resulting temperature increase. One must warm the ocean to warm the climate. It takes several decades just to warm the upper layers of the ocean. It takes centuries for the long-run temperature to be reached. The rising temperature is expected to increase the speed of the hydrological cycle. This will lead to an increase in evaporation, an increase in precipitation, and an increase in the amount of water in the atmosphere. Water vapor itself is a greenhouse gas. It represents a positive feedback mechanism and it contributes significantly to the prediction of a 3°C increase from doubling greenhouse gases. So the expectation of increased rainfall is part of the explanation why there is such a large temperature increase. That does not mean there will be increased rainfall everywhere. It simply means that average global rainfall will increase. The level of CO2 has a direct effect on ecosystems. All plants respond to higher CO2 levels in a positive fashion. Grasses respond only slightly to CO2 fertilization, whereas the yields of most crops respond vigorously. Hundreds of laboratory studies reveal an average increase in crop yields of 30 percent as CO2 concentrations double (Kimball 2007). Climate change is expected to melt ice formations. Many glaciers on land have already shrunk in response to warming, increasing flows in nearby rivers. The Arctic ice covering the sea in the North Pole is shrinking rapidly, exposing the Arctic air to the warm sea underneath and causing the most rapid warming on the planet (IPCC 2014a). Large remaining glaciers in Greenland and Antarctica might melt over the next thousand years (IPCC 2014a). The melting of the large ice deposits in Greenland and Antarctica would cause the oceans to rise to new levels never before experienced by mankind. Climate change is expected to have one final impact. In addition to the mean temperature and precipitation levels rising, there may be a change in the distribution of weather. Seasonal patterns may change with more warming in winter than summer. Interannual variance might change. Diurnal variance may drop as nights become warmer relative to days. Tropical cyclones may become more powerful. The pattern of global winds may change, shifting moisture from one place to another. More is known about global mean changes than these other changes in the distribution. It is more difficult to study variance and even more difficult to study extreme events. But it is likely that the distribution of weather events will change. What then is the consequence of climate change if greenhouse gases cause all these changes? What sectors of the economy are vulnerable? What nonmarket goods and services are at risk? The literature on impacts has long identified most of the sectors likely to be affected by climate change (Pearce et al. 1996). The vulnerable economic sectors include agriculture, coasts, forests, water, and energy. Important sectors outside the economy that would be affected include recreation, ecosystem change, human health, and aesthetics. The controversy about impacts does not concern what will be affected. The controversy is measuring the magnitude of the impact. Some studies report damages to mankind equal to 20 percent of total income (Stern 2007). Other studies suggest more modest effects of less than 2 percent of income (Pearce et al. 1996; Nordhaus 1991). Yet other studies suggest impacts may be closer to 0.2 percent of income (Mendelsohn et al. 2006). What explains estimates that vary by orders of magnitude? Although some authors speculate about exponentially increasing damage (Stern 2007), empirical analysis suggests that most sectors respond to temperature in a hill-shaped fashion (Mendelsohn and Schlesinger 1999; Tol 2002a). For each sector, there is an ideal temperature where the net value of that sector is highest. If temperatures are either colder or warmer than this ideal, warming will be either beneficial or harmful, respectively. Three important insights follow from this result. First, warming will be beneficial to relatively cool countries and harmful to relatively warm countries. Warming will not have the same universal effect on everybody. Low-latitude countries may well suffer 60 to 80 percent of the global damage (Mendelsohn et al. 2006). This is problematic because these low-latitude countries collectively contribute only a small fraction of global emissions. A large fraction of the damage from climate change is not suffered by the countries causing the emissions. There is an inherent inequity in the distribution of the costs and benefits of greenhouse gas emissions. Second, the warmer the planet gets, the more damage that warming will cause. More and more countries will be pushed beyond the ideal temperature range, and the more local temperatures exceed that range, the greater the damage will be. Third, because the most serious damage requires relatively high temperatures, a large fraction of the damage will not occur until far into the future. The present value of damage is consequently quite small. The literature also contains one other important insight. Adaptation is very effective at lowering climate damage (Mendelsohn and Neumann 1999; Mendelsohn and Dinar 2009). Firms, farms, and people will all change their behavior as climate changes. They will subtly adjust their timing, their choices, and their management to take into account the climate that they actually live in. One can see this today by comparing the behavior of people who happen to live in different climates. Farmers in warmer places plant crops suitable for that climate. People wear clothing appropriate to their climate and season. Buildings have heating and cooling systems appropriate for each climate. People and firms adapt to climate because it is in their interest to do so. Adaptation makes them better off. That does not imply there are no damages. It simply points out that assuming zero adaptation is not realistic. The damage is much lower when people adjust. It may be more difficult to predict what will happen with adaptation, but simply assuming it away leads to overly pessimistic predictions of damage. Predictions of impacts from climate change must take private adaptation into account in order to provide accurate measures of future damages (Mendelsohn 2000).

#### You read a laundry list card that doesn’t say extinction and presupposes a world in which we completely ignore scientists. We read blue -

Specktor 19 [Brandon writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years] 6-4-2019, "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html> JW

\*\*Cites and talks about the Spratt and Dunlop study

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom.

How the world ends

What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions.

"Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of [lethal heat conditions](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized.

Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert. Entire ecosystems collapse, beginning with the planet's coral reefs, the rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets. The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees.

This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to stress the fabric of the world's largest nations, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in nuclear war, are likely.

The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

### Great Power War

#### Obviously AIDs spread won’t lead to war – their card says it causes political instability in the US and China but COVID didn’t cause that so it thumps + their ev is from 2010

#### AIDS decreasing—contained in 20 years

Kelland 14 7/16 (Kate, contributor, Kate, Global AIDS epidemic can be controlled by 2030, U.N. says <http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/07/16/us-health-hiv-unaids-idUSKBN0FL0RX20140716>, TF)

New HIV infections and deaths from AIDS are decreasing, the United Nations said on Wednesday, making it possible to control the epidemic by 2030 and eventually end it "in every region, in every country".¶ "More than ever before, there is hope that ending AIDS is possible. However, a business-as-usual approach or simply sustaining the AIDS response at its current pace cannot end the epidemic," the U.N. AIDS program UNAIDS said in a global report issued ahead of an AIDS conference in Melbourne, Australia next week.¶ It said the number of people infected with HIV was stabilizing at around 35 million worldwide. The epidemic had killed some 39 million of the 78 million people it has affected since it began in the 1980s.¶ "The AIDS epidemic can be ended in every region, every country, in every location, in every population and every community," Michel Sidibe, the director of UNAIDS, said in the report. "There are multiple reasons why there is hope and conviction about this goal."¶ The human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) that causes AIDS can be transmitted via blood, breast milk and by semen during sex, but can be kept in check with cocktails of drugs known as antiretroviral therapy or ART.¶ UNAIDS said that at the end of 2013, some 12.9 million HIV positive people had access to antiretroviral therapy - a dramatic improvement on the 10 million who were on treatment just one year earlier and the only 5 million who were getting AIDS drugs in 2010.¶ Since 2001, new HIV infections have fallen by 38 percent, it said. AIDS deaths have fallen 35 percent since a peak in 2005.¶ "The world has witnessed extraordinary changes in the AIDS landscape. There have been more achievements in the past five years than in the preceding 23 years," the report said.¶ The U.N. report said ending the AIDS epidemic by 2030 would mean the spread of HIV was being controlled or contained, and that the impact of the virus in societies and in people's lives had been reduced by significant declines in ill health, stigma, deaths and the number of AIDS orphans.¶ "It means increased life expectancy, unconditional acceptance of people's diversity and rights, and increased productivity and reduced costs as the impact diminishes."¶ According to UNAIDS, $19.1 billion was available from all sources for the AIDS response in 2013, and the estimated annual need by 2015 is currently between $22 billion and $24 billion.¶ Sidibe said the international community should seize the opportunity to turn the epidemic around.¶ "We have a fragile five-year window to build on the rapid results that been made," he said. "If we accelerate all HIV scale-up by 2020, we will be on track to end the epidemic by 2030. If not, we risk significantly increasing the time it would take - adding a decade, if not more."¶ He said controlling the epidemic by 2030 would avert 18 million new HIV infections and 11.2 million AIDS deaths between 2013 and 2030.¶ In 2011, U.N. member states agreed to a target of getting HIV treatment to 15 million people by 2015. As countries scaled up treatment coverage, and evidence showed how treating HIV early also reduces its spread, the World Health Organization (WHO) set new guidelines last year, expanding the number of people needing treatment by more than 10 million.¶ Jennifer Cohn, medical director of the access campaign for the charity Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), said millions of HIV positive people still do not get the drugs they needed.¶ "Providing life-saving HIV treatment to nearly 12 million people in the developing world is a significant achievement, but more than half of people in need still do not have access," she said. "We know that early treatment helps prevent transmission of HIV and keeps people healthy; we need to respond to HIV in all contexts and make treatment accessible to everyone in need as soon as possible."

### India Soft Power

#### Domestic issues structurally weaken India’s position in the global realm, which thumps the disad – evaluate recent ev because Modi’s second term has been completely different from his first.

Muhsin Puthan 20 [Muhsin Puthan is a Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science at University of Hyderabad, India. His research interests include international relations, India’s foreign policy, political communication, soft power, and public diplomacy.) "Is India Still a Rising Superpower?," Diplomat Media Inc., 02-26-2020] SM

Since Narendra Modi came to power in 2014 he has actively pursued India’s international relations. While it is debatable how much his foreign policy activism has delivered in concrete terms, it has undoubtedly brought greater vigor and enthusiasm into India’s foreign policy. Some of his notable foreign policy pursuits include greater attention on expanding India’s soft power through cultural diplomacy, effective engagement with the Middle East, increased outreach to the Indian diaspora, and a leadership role in climate change (and particularly solar energy).Much for the same reason, while Modi was seeking re-election last year, foreign policy received greater expectations from both policy circles and the general public. The notion of the rise of India’s international prestige that Modi had managed to cultivate seemingly played a contributing role in the his landslide victory the secured his second term.However, hardly a year into office, Modi’s second term has already given overwhelming indications of a scenario in which India is losing its grip over maintaining the status quo. Foreign policy challenges are mounting, especially emerging from the domestic political arena — and some of them are clearly the result of the government’s own mistakes, coupled with deeply misplaced national priorities that do not accord with the reality and thus suggest a lack of global vision. While prudence dictates maintaining momentum in foreign policy for long-term benefits, unfortunately India’s international relations have become a hostage to its own domestic political and social chaos, if current trends are a reliable indicator. And the severe downturn in India’s economy further adds to its woes.

India Pitting Its Domestic Policies Against Its ‘Rising Superpower’ Status

The notion of India as a “rising global power” received wider acceptance when then-U.S. President Barack Obama, on a visit to India in 2010, dramatically said that “India is not just a rising power; India has already risen.” Notably, the rhetorical elevation of India was part of the U.S. strategy of countering a rising China. Yet Obama’s statement also attested to the prevailing perception of India as a capable and responsible power. This perception was not solely based on India’s stable and solid economy, which was touching a growth rate of 9.8 percent in October 2009. Other reasons for this positive image include India’s long democratic credentials and achievements as well as its success in upholding values and ideals such as multiculturalism, pluralism, secularism, tolerance, and international peace. All of these, while seemingly taken for granted, have been crucial for India’s rising superpower status. Nonetheless, as we speak, India’s domestic politics seems to be driving its foreign policy in a different direction. In fact, there has evidently been a rather dominant shift of focus to domestic politics, overriding the larger foreign policy concerns. And unfortunately, this flirting with domestic politics at the cost of foreign relations has clearly been accompanied by scant regard for acquiring and maintaining cultural and political attraction, and international prestige in the global community. As a matter of fact, while Modi’s foreign policy activism during his first tenure received much appreciation, to the point of many even comparing him with Nehru, his second tenure manifests a rather completely different picture. Modi is strikingly dismantling many of his own contribution to the building of India’s image. A number of domestic political concerns have been at the forefront of inducing new foreign policy challenges. By bringing religion in as a criteria in the determination of citizenship through the recently legislated Citizenship (Amendment) Act (CAA), the government has egregiously undermined the considerable applicability of India’s historic ideals and the domestic roots of India’s foreign policy, including pluralism and secular values. The move bolstered and accentuated the deepening religious and social polarization that has become a new normal in India in recent years.

In parallel, there has also been brutal violence and the use of aggressive force in suppressing protests against the CAA. The inevitable result of all this has been opposition from different parts of the world and growing concerns from various quarters of South Asia as well as from the UN and other human rights organizations. Such a mounting opposition to the policy has led Modi’s government to upend its diplomatic efforts to weather the storm. However, despite these efforts — and the Ministry of External Affairs’ claim that many countries have understood that it is an internal matter of India — the indeterminate and the ongoing protests in different parts of the country seem to be making countries rethink their position. Many countries have now broken their silence to voice concerns on the issue, including the EU Parliament’s move to bring an anti-CAA resolution.Likewise, last year’s controversial revocation of Article 370 of the Indian Constitution, which gave special power status to the only Muslim-dominated state of Jammu and Kashmir, and the subsequent internet lockdown in the state since then, has also caught international attention for the allegedly rampant human rights violations. Certainly, terming these as internal matters of India neither allays these concerns nor constitutes an effective face-saving gambit to limit the damage.Moreover, even faced with a situation where tremendous diplomatic efforts are required to douse international concerns, India’s diplomatic endeavors to this end have so far been poor, especially its public diplomacy engagements. On the other hand, the ruling Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) and its ideological parent, Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), have already conducted large-scale outreach programs in the domestic sphere, including door-to-door campaigns. As such, the question is not whether India has the practical savvy to deal with the fallout from its decisions; rather it is about whether India is willing, in all seriousness, to at least present a plausible narrative on the world stage.The inevitable inference from these policies is the fact that the government’s overriding priority lies in domestic political consolidation and the expansion of the BJP’s power. However, as a “rising superpower” India is expected to offer an appealing political and development vision for the world. Such policies, albeit domestic, can be counterproductive and have implications for India’s international relations.At this juncture the question inevitably arises; can India champion the values of international order at a time when there are greater aspirations from Asian countries to play a significant role in the world order? Unfortunately, a cursory glance at India’s recent domestic policies shows that India sits uneasily with such a goal, if not completely at loggerheads. For instance, India’s advocacy of a “free, open and inclusive” Indo-Pacific is unlikely to find resonance in the international arena if these values are on a shaky foundation at home. The sharp contrast that India’s recent domestic policies pose vis-a-vis the spirit of liberal democracy is telling. It compels a probe into what actually represents India’s world view — and whether India has one at all.

### Drug Prices

#### Obviously missing a massive internal link between drug prices being expensive and widespread income inequality

#### 80% of people are in poverty – non uq

#### Price controls gut biotech innovation

Easton 18 (Robert J. Easton is co-chairman of Bionest Partners, a global medical business consultancy serving pharmaceutical, medical device, and diagnostic firms and their investors, “Price controls would stifle innovation in the pharmaceutical industry”, STAT News, January 22, 2018, <https://www.statnews.com/2018/01/22/price-controls-pharmaceutical-industry/>) \*language modified

Consumer access to affordable and effective medicines is an important issue. As the cost of many drugs continues to rise, sometimes astronomically, some have suggested imposing price controls on the U.S. pharmaceutical industry. Doing that risks ~~crippling~~ [crushing] our only hope of curing the many serious diseases that still plague us.

The global pharmaceutical industry is among the most profitable, driven by its ability to price to value, especially in the United States. High profits attract investors and generate money for research. The global pharmaceutical industry’s investment in research and development is second, barely, to the computer and electronics industry and well beyond that of most other industries. For comparison, the top 10 pharmaceutical companies spend five times more on research and development as a percent of sales than do the top 18 U.S. chemical companies.

The pharma industry’s efforts have been quite productive in attacking some of the most vexing problems in medicine. Cardiovascular mortality in the U.S. has declined more than 50 percent since the introduction of propranolol, the first beta blocker, in 1964. Many cancers, such as childhood leukemia, have almost been cured. AIDS is now a chronic disease, as the death rate has declined from near 100 percent to near 0 percent. Hepatitis C is now curable. Even metastatic melanoma, formerly a death sentence for 95 percent of its victims, is now curable for many. Lung cancer may be next. All these miracles have been brought through the clinic and into the market by commercial pharmaceutical companies.

Yet there remain huge unmet needs for new and better treatments for most cancers; all neurological problems, especially Alzheimer’s disease; most autoimmune diseases; most major gastrointestinal disorders; macular degeneration; and diabetes — not to mention the global scourge of drug-resistant bacterial and viral infections. Advances in these areas will come if money continues flowing to pharmaceutical companies and their primary sources of innovation, biotechnology startups.

But if U.S. drug prices come under bureaucratic control, as they have in most of Europe and Japan, it will be a different story. Little pharmaceutical innovation occurs in price-control jurisdictions. The United States has always, by a large margin, led the world as a source of new drugs, and that lead has widened as Japan and Germany have imposed price controls over the past few decades. All major international pharmaceutical companies, without exception, have instituted R&D and commercial operations in the U.S. to take advantage of its pricing environment.

If price controls pressure the U.S. industry into a more conventional process industry model, like that of the chemical industry, pharmaceutical R&D budgets would be slashed. To achieve the chemical industry’s rate of R&D spending, as would be required to achieve profitability competitive with the chemical industry, top pharmaceutical companies would have to reduce their R&D budgets by 80 percent — almost $50 billion in total. This reduction in spending would take a few years to realize, but would be completely evident by 2023 or earlier.

An important corollary is that, if profitability and value creation opportunities for new drugs declined, the appetite of the venture community for risky, long-term biopharmaceutical investments would shrink exponentially. Price controls on drugs would have the surprising effect of accelerating the flow of investment into high technology, where timelines to market are shorter, less regulated, and less risky. The venture capital community is flush with cash and anxious to invest where high returns can be achieved — ideally within a much shorter time than is typically possible in the realm of drug R&D.

As a society, if we force pharma into a chemical industry model, where there is no biotech equivalent and no venture investing, we will be trading better and sooner effective drugs for better and sooner virtual reality devices and self-driving cars.

### Extra

#### Ice age coming but warming stops it

Martin 20 [Sean Martin, 2-7-2020, "Ice age shock: ‘Timing is right for the next ice age to come around soon’," Express.co.uk, https://www.express.co.uk/news/science/1239246/ice-age-long-range-weather-forecast-climate-change-weather-warning, accessed 9-5-2020]LHSBC

* Citing James Renwick from the School of Geography, Environment, and Earth Sciences at the University of Wellington

Over millions of years, Earth goes through ice ages and then warm periods depending on the planet’s rotation around the Sun. Currently, it is in a warmer period – although it is important to note that it is exacerbated by global warming and not an explanation for the unnaturally [warming planet](https://www.express.co.uk/latest/climate-change).∂ However, a climate scientist has said Earth should be gearing up to go through another ice age soon.∂ There have been at least five major ice ages on Earth throughout its history, with the last one ending roughly 12,800 years ago.∂ These ice ages lasted for hundreds of thousands of years and saw temperatures drop sharply across the globe – cold enough to stop snow from melting and causing glaciers to form.∂ Professor James Renwick from the School of Geography, Environment, and Earth Sciences at the University of Wellington has said the planet should be going through a cooler period in due time.∂ He wrote in an article for the Conversation: “The timing is right for the next ice age to come around soon.∂ “For the past two and a half million years, the Earth has experienced regular ice ages, related to slow changes to earth’s orbit around the sun and changes in the earth’s axis of rotation (Milankovitch cycles).∂ “We are currently in one of the warm periods (interglacials) between ice ages and the present interglacial should be ending about now.”∂ However, Prof Renwick added: “There is a catch”.∂ Due to human activity and the pumping of greenhouse gasses into the atmosphere, the next ice age has been seriously delayed.∂ Carbon dioxide traps heat within the atmosphere, which is preventing the planet from going into another cooling cycle.∂ This is yet further evidence that human activity is destroying the fragile ecosystem of the planet.∂ Prof Renwick said: “Ice ages didn’t happen for millions of years because there was too much carbon dioxide in the air.∂ “The change in sunlight associated with the ice age cycles is quite subtle and takes thousands of years to make a difference to temperatures and to ice gain or loss.∂ “When atmospheric carbon dioxide is above about 300 parts per million, the infrared warming effect is so strong it drowns out the more subtle Milankovitch cycles and there are no ice ages.∂ “Coming out of the Pliocene period just under three million years ago, carbon dioxide levels dropped low enough for the ice age cycles to commence.∂ “Now, carbon dioxide levels are over 400 parts per million and are likely to stay there for thousands of years, so the next ice age is postponed for a very long time.

#### Ice age causes extinction—

Chapman 8 (Phil, geophysicist and astronautical engineer, bachelor of science degree in Physics and Mathematics from Sydney University, a master of science degree in Aeronautics and Astronautics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Sorry to ruin the fun, but an ice age cometh,” 4/23/08, The Australian, <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/sorry-to-ruin-the-fun-but-an-ice-age-cometh/story-e6frg73o-1111116134873>)

What is scary about the picture is that there is only one tiny sunspot. Disconcerting as it may be to true believers in global warming, the average temperature on Earth has remained steady or slowly declined during the past decade, despite the continued increase in the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide, and now the global temperature is falling precipitously. All four agencies that track Earth's temperature (the Hadley Climate Research Unit in Britain, the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York, the Christy group at the University of Alabama, and Remote Sensing Systems Inc in California) report that it cooled by about 0.7C in 2007. This is the fastest temperature change in the instrumental record and it puts us back where we were in 1930. If the temperature does not soon recover, we will have to conclude that global warming is over. There is also plenty of anecdotal evidence that 2007 was exceptionally cold. It snowed in Baghdad for the first time in centuries, the winter in China was simply terrible and the extent of Antarctic sea ice in the austral winter was the greatest on record since James Cook discovered the place in 1770. It is generally not possible to draw conclusions about climatic trends from events in a single year, so I would normally dismiss this cold snap as transient, pending what happens in the next few years. This is where SOHO comes in. The sunspot number follows a cycle of somewhat variable length, averaging 11 years. The most recent minimum was in March last year. The new cycle, No.24, was supposed to start soon after that, with a gradual build-up in sunspot numbers. It didn't happen. The first sunspot appeared in January this year and lasted only two days. A tiny spot appeared last Monday but vanished within 24 hours. Another little spot appeared this Monday. Pray that there will be many more, and soon. The reason this matters is that there is a close correlation between variations in the sunspot cycle and Earth's climate. The previous time a cycle was delayed like this was in the Dalton Minimum, an especially cold period that lasted several decades from 1790. Northern winters became ferocious: in particular, the rout of Napoleon's Grand Army during the retreat from Moscow in 1812 was at least partly due to the lack of sunspots. That the rapid temperature decline in 2007 coincided with the failure of cycle No.24 to begin on schedule is not proof of a causal connection but it is cause for concern. It is time to put aside the global warming dogma, at least to begin contingency planning about what to do if we are moving into another little ice age, similar to the one that lasted from 1100 to 1850. There is no doubt that **the next little ice age would be much worse than the previous one and much more harmful than anything warming may do.** There are many more people now and we have become dependent on a few temperate agricultural areas, especially in the US and Canada. Global warming would increase agricultural output, but global cooling will decrease it. Millions will starve if we do nothing to prepare for it (such as planning changes in agriculture to compensate), and millions more will die from cold-related diseases. There is also another possibility, remote but much more serious. The Greenland and Antarctic ice cores and other evidence show that for the past several million years, severe glaciation has almost always afflicted our planet. The bleak truth is that, under normal conditions, most of North America and Europe are buried under about 1.5km of ice. This bitterly frigid climate is interrupted occasionally by brief warm interglacials, typically lasting less than 10,000 years. The interglacial we have enjoyed throughout recorded human history, called the Holocene, began 11,000 years ago, so the ice is overdue. We also know that glaciation can occur quickly: the required decline in global temperature is about 12C and it can happen in 20 years. The next descent into an ice age is inevitable but may not happen for another 1000 years. On the other hand, it must be noted that the cooling in 2007 was even faster than in typical glacial transitions. If it continued for 20 years, the temperature would be 14C cooler in 2027. By then, most of the advanced nations would have ceased to exist, vanishing under the ice, and the rest of the world would be faced with a catastrophe beyond imagining. Australia may escape total annihilation but would surely be overrun by millions of refugees. Once the glaciation starts, it will last 1000 centuries, an incomprehensible stretch of time. If the ice age is coming, there is a small chance that we could prevent or at least delay the transition, if we are prepared to take action soon enough and on a large enough scale. For example: We could gather all the bulldozers in the world and use them to dirty the snow in Canada and Siberia in the hope of reducing the reflectance so as to absorb more warmth from the sun. We also may be able to release enormous floods of methane (a potent greenhouse gas) from the hydrates under the Arctic permafrost and on the continental shelves, perhaps using nuclear weapons to destabilise the deposits. We cannot really know, but my guess is that the odds are at least 50-50 that we will see significant cooling rather than warming in coming decades. The probability that we are witnessing the onset of a real ice age is much less, perhaps one in 500, but not totally negligible. All those urging action to curb global warming need to take off the blinkers and give some thought to what we should do if we are facing global cooling instead. It will be difficult for people to face the truth when their reputations, careers, government grants or hopes for social change depend on global warming, but the fate of civilisation may be at stake. In the famous words of Oliver Cromwell, "I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken."

#### Squo solves superbugs, and it doesn’t require more innovation

Sprenger 17 (Marc Sprenger, [WHO Director, Antimicrobial Resistance Secretariat, ], 5-29-2017, “Superbugs: The world is taking action, but low-income countries must not be left behind“, No Publication, accessed: 9-5-2021, https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/superbugs-the-world-is-taking-action-but-low-income-countries-must-not-be-left-behind) ajs

Now, antimicrobial resistance has finally come to the forefront in health and political circles, leading to the development in 2015 of a Global Action Plan, endorsed by Ministers of Health and Agriculture at the governing bodies of WHO, FAO and OIE, and Heads of State at a high-level meeting of the UN General Assembly last September. Since then, countries have been developing national action plans to put the globally-agreed policy changes into practice.

Our survey of country progress offers some good news. More than 90% of people in the world (6.5 billion) live in a country that has developed, or is developing, a national action plan on antimicrobial resistance. Some of the key areas in which countries report that they are doing well are: training doctors, nurses, and other health workers on how to reduce the spread of antimicrobial resistance; improving the prevention and control of infections; and strengthening systems to detect the extent of the problem. These are incredible achievements. National plans are multisectoral—which means that leaders in human health, animal health, and the environment, who often talk about joined-up approaches, are actually putting it into action.

When you drill down into the numbers, a slightly less rosy picture emerges. High-income countries that already have stronger health and agricultural systems are much better prepared to deal with antimicrobial resistance—more than 80% of these countries have a plan in place, or are developing one. By contrast, about 30% of low-income countries either have or are developing a plan. This is not surprising. Many low-income countries lack the expertise or capacity to develop a national plan, or they are overwhelmed by dealing with fragile health systems or outbreaks of infectious diseases.

Yet low-income countries are the ones that need to be the best prepared since they are likely to bear the brunt of resistance: infectious diseases are much more common, and their health systems are much weaker and less able to adapt as first-line antibiotics (which tend to be cheaper) become less effective. The burden of harder-to-treat infectious diseases and the impact of treatment failure in human lives and relative economic cost will be much higher than in richer countries.

The lack of preparedness in low-income countries should concern us all, no matter how rich a country we live in. Antibiotic resistance will not just affect the ability to treat diseases such as malaria or tuberculosis, which many might think occur in the poorest parts of the world. Resistant bacteria will challenge our ability to treat women in childbirth, people undergoing surgery, or those on cancer chemotherapy. And, in a globalized world, microbes don’t respect national borders. They spread with ease.

So how can we support all countries to be better prepared? WHO is providing training and support to several countries, but my hope is that other development partners will engage to support implementation in low-income countries. There are many more immediate and visible problems in these countries, but not addressing antimicrobial resistance straight away, threatens the sustainability of recent progress in fragile health systems and creates a global risk.

The survey shows, perhaps not surprisingly, that strengthening the health response will be challenging, but an even greater challenge will be to build resilient systems in other sectors. Antimicrobial resistance is not just a health issue—it is a development issue. We need to engage with the development community to strengthen health, agricultural and environmental systems. National governments, development agencies and banks need to invest in national action plans now to prevent the greater impact on health, economic development and livestock production.

The good news is that we know how to reduce antimicrobial resistance. We need to reduce the need for antimicrobials through good clinical practice, immunization, improvements in water, sanitation and hygiene, and good animal husbandry; we also need to ensure that these medicines are used more prudently in both people and animals, through better diagnostics, better access to the right drugs, and better regulation of antibiotics. We also need a much better system for monitoring supplies of drugs, where they are shipped, how they are distributed, and monitoring and reporting of the prevalence of drug-resistant infections in humans and animals.

This is a complex puzzle, but one that we can solve. It is one that, for the sake of the world’s health and wealth, we must solve.

#### circum