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#### Counterplan Text:

#### 1. The World Trade Organization ought to be abolished.

#### 2. The member nations of the WTO ought to independently and without influence from international government eliminate patent protections for medicines

Hawley, senator, JD Yale, 20

(Josh, 5-5, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/05/opinion/hawley-abolish-wto-china.html)

The coronavirus emergency is not only a public health crisis. With [30 million Americans unemployed](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/04/30/us-weekly-jobless-claims.html), it is also an economic crisis. And it has exposed a hard truth about the modern global economy: it weakens American workers and has empowered China’s rise. That must change. The global economic system as we know it is a relic; it requires reform, top to bottom. We should begin with one of its leading institutions, the World Trade Organization. We should abolish it.

**Eliminating the WTO ends U.S. global hegemony**

**Bello, PhD, 2000**

(Walden, Sociology @ Stanford, https://users.ox.ac.uk/~magd1352/ecologist/Should%20WTO%20be%20abolished.pdf)

The idea that the world needs the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is one of the biggest lies of our time. The WTO came about, in 1995, mainly because it was in the interest of the US and its corporations. The European Union, Japan and especially the developing countries were mostly ambivalent about the idea; it was the US which drove it on. Why? Because though the US, back in 1948, blocked the formation of an International Trade Organisation (ITO), believing that, at that time, the interests of its corporations would not be served by such a global body, it had changed its mind by the 1990s. Now it wanted an international trade body. Why? Because its global economic dominance was threatened. The flexible GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) system, which preceded the WTO, had allowed the emergence of Europe and East Asia as competing industrial centres that threatened US dominance even in many high-tech industries. Under GATT’s system of global agricultural trade, Europe had emerged as a formidable agricultural power even as Third World governments concerned with preserving their agriculture and rural societies limited the penetration of their markets by US agricultural products. In other words, before the WTO, **global trade was growing by leaps and bounds**, but countries were using trade policy to industrialise and adapt to the growth of trade so that their economies would be enhanced by global trade and not be marginalised by it. That was a problem, from the US point of view. And that was why the US needed the WTO. The essence of the WTO is seen in three of its central agreements: the Agreement on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), the Agreement on Agriculture (AOA), and the Agreement on Trade Related Investment Measures (TRIMs). The purpose of TRIPs is **not to promote free trade but to enhance monopoly power**. One cannot quarrel with the fact that innovators should have preferential access to the benefits that flow from their innovation for a period of time. TRIPs, however, goes beyond this to institutionalise a monopoly for high-tech corporate innovators, most of them from the North. Among other things, TRIPs provides a generalised minimum patent protection of 20 years; institutes draconian border regulations against products judged to be violating intellectual property rights; and – contrary to the judicial principle of presuming innocence until proven guilty – places the burden of proof on the presumed violator of process patents. What TRIPs does is reinforce the monopolistic or oligopolistic position of US high tech firms such as Microsoft and Intel. It makes industrialisation by imitation or industrialisation via loose conditions of technology transfer – a strategy employed by the US, Germany, Japan, and South Korea during the early phases of their industrialisation – all but impossible. It enables **the technological leader**, in this case **the US, to greatly influence** **the pace of technological and industrial development in the rest of the world**.

**Primacy causes endless war, terror, authoritarianism, prolif, and Russia-China aggression.**

**Ashford, PhD, 19**

(Emma, PoliSci@UVA, Fellow@CATO, Power and Pragmatism: Reforming American Foreign Policy for the 21st Century, in New Voices in Grand Strategy, 4, CNAS)

Humility is a virtue. Yet in the last quarter century, American policymakers have been far more likely to embrace the notion of America as the “indispensable nation,” responsible for protecting allies, promoting democracy and human rights, tamping down conflicts, and generally managing global affairs. Compare this ideal to the U.S. track record – endless Middle Eastern wars, the rise of ISIS, global democratic backsliding, a revanchist Russia, resurgent China, and a world reeling from the election of President Donald Trump – and this label seems instead **the height of hubris.** Many of the failures of U.S. foreign policy speak for themselves. As the daily drumbeat of bad news attests, interventions in Iraq and Libya were not victories for human rights or democracy, but rather massively destabilizing for the Middle East as a whole. Afghanistan – despite initial military successes – has become a quagmire, highlighting the futility of nation- building. Other failures of America’s grand strategy are less visible, but no less damaging. NATO expansion into Eastern Europe helped to reignite hostility between Russia and the West. Worse, it has diluted the alliance’s defensive capacity and its democratic character. And even as the war on terror fades from public view, it remains as open-ended as ever: Today, the United States is at war in seven countries and engaged in “combating terrorism’ in more than 80.1 To put it bluntly: America’s strategy since the end of the Cold War – **whether it is called primacy or liberal internationalism** – may not be a total failure, but it **has not been successful** either. Many have tried to place blame for these poor outcomes.2 But recrimination is less important than understanding why America’s strategy has failed so badly and avoiding these mistakes in future. Much of the explanation is the natural outcome of changing constraints. Iraq and Libya should not be viewed as regrettable anomalies, but rather the logical outcome of unipolarity and America’s liberal internationalist inclination to solve every global problem. It’s also a reliance on flawed assumptions – that what is good for America is always good for the world, for example. Support for dangerous sovereignty-undermining norms adds to the problem; just look at the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), which has proved not to protect populations or stabilize fragile states, but to provoke chaos, encourage nuclear proliferation, and undermine the international institutions.Perhaps, if nothing else had changed, a form of watered-down liberal internationalism that foreswore interventionism and drew back from the war on terror might have been possible.3 But international politics are undergoing a period of profound transformation, from unipolarity to regional or even global multipolarity. Primacy – and the consistent drumbeat of calls in Washington to do more, always and everywhere – is neither sustainable nor prudent. Nor can we fall back on warmed-over Cold War–era strategies better suited to an era of bipolar superpower competition.

#### Extinction – nuclear winter, crude oil amplifies, smoke covers the world

Snydera and Ruyle 17 (Brian F.Snydera and Leslie E. Ruyle, 12-15-2017, [Brian F. Snyder. Department of Environmental Science, Louisiana State University, United States. Leslie E. Ruyle. Center on Conflict and Development, Texas A&M University, United States]"The abolition of war as a goal of environmental policy," No Publication, [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969717316431?via%3Dihub)//SLC](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969717316431?via%3Dihub)//CHS) PK

While the precise impacts of a hypothetical nuclear war are difficult to predict, the detonation of the world's nuclear weapons would plausibly kill all or nearly all humans on Earth and initiate a mass extinction event. There are a total of about 9400 nuclear warheads in active service around the world, with approximately 8300 of these weapons in U.S. and Russian arsenals (Kristensen and Norris, 2017a). Because of government secrecy, it is difficult to reliably estimate the total explosive power contained in these warheads, but in most cases, each warhead ranges between 100 and 1200 kt of TNT equivalent (for comparison, the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki had yields of approximately 15–20 kt). The combined arsenals of the U.S. and Russia likely have a yield of at least 2–3 billion tons of TNT equivalent (Kristensen and Norris, 2017b,c). 2.1. Nuclear winter In the 1980s climate scientists used simple and early climate models to estimate the effects of large-scale nuclear wars on climate. The estimates they derived were catastrophic. For example, Turco et al. (1983) reported temperature reductions of 43 °C for 4 months in the Northern Hemisphere following nuclear war using the explosive power of 10 billion tons of TNT.1 As the cold war ended, interest in modelling the climate effects of nuclear war declined and some policy-makers considered the threat of nuclear winter to be either disproved or exaggerated (Martin, 1988). Toon et al. (2007) and Robock et al. (2007) reignited interest in the climate effects of nuclear war. Toon et al. (2008) modeled the effects of a medium scale nuclear war with a total explosive yield of 440 million tons of explosive yield (far less than current U.S. and Russian arsenals) and estimated global soot2 emissions of 180 Tg. Using a more conservative estimate of 150 Tg of soot, Toon et al. estimated that this emission would be sufficient to reduce global temperatures by about 8 °C and energy flux by 150 W/m2 ; for comparison, the cumulative greenhouse gas emissions to the atmosphere since the industrial revolution have increased energy flux by 3 W/m2 (Butler and Montzka, 2017). Robock et al. (2007) modeled a similar 150 Tg smoke emission and found similar results including temperature reduction of about 8 °C lasting for several years. Low temperatures reduced evapotranspiration and weakened the global hydrological cycle and Hadley cells. As a result, precipitation decreased globally by 45% with especially dramatic decreases in the agricultural areas of the United States. In the Northern Hemisphere, growing seasons would be shortened by about 100 days for about 3 years. This would preclude most food production over most of the world for several years. Mills et al. (2014) conducted a detailed analysis of the effects of a small (1.5 million ton) regional exchange lofting just 5 Tg of soot into the atmosphere. This war would be equivalent to an exchange of 100 Hiroshima-sized bombs between, for example, India, Pakistan, or China. Mills et al. found global temperature decreases of 1.6 °C. To our knowledge, no one has studied the effects of a multi-billion ton nuclear exchange using modern atmospheric models. If, as Toon et al. and Robock et al. suggest, a 440 million ton war results in temperature reductions of 8 °C for a decade and a 100 day reduction in the growing season, it is reasonable to assume that a one to five billion ton war would not be survivable for the majority of people on earth. However, as populations and population centers grow, the effects of nuclear wars on the biosphere will also grow. The consequences of nuclear winter increase as the amount of fuel (buildings, cars, biomass, liquid and solid fuels) added to a targeted area increase. As population centers grow and densify over time, the amount of soot added to the stratosphere as the result of any given nuclear exchange may increase (depending in part on building materials). As a result, the nuclear winter resulting from a 400 million ton yield global war in 2020 may be far more severe than if the same war occurred in 2000. Further, there are reasons to believe that the soot emissions from a hypothetical nuclear exchange are conservative because they focus on urban areas and often do not incorporate non-urban energy infrastructure. For example, if ignited and burned completely, the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) alone contains about 14.5 Tg of soot emissions.3 Including all crude held in U.S. commercial facilities, the potential soot emissions increase to 24 Tg. Thus, incorporating crude oil storage in the U.S. alone would increase soot generation estimates by about 16%. Similarly, nuclear war planners would be likely to target coal, oil and gas fields in the U.S., Russia, and their allies. This unaccounted for fuel could increase the total soot contribution to the atmosphere, potentially deepening the resulting nuclear winter. 2.2. Acute effects of particulate matter Studies of nuclear winter typically focus on the effects of smoke lofted into the stratosphere during nuclear firestorms. However, a larger proportion of smoke following nuclear war will be trapped in the troposphere where it would have significantly acute impacts on human and non-human species. Crutzen et al. (1984) calculated that following a major nuclear war (about 5 billion tons of explosives, roughly the combined U.S. and Russian deployed nuclear arms as of 2017) smoke would cover about 30–40% of the earth's surface with airborne smoke concentrations on the order of 5 mg/m3 . While initially this smoke would be composed of very small particles (b0.1 μm), the particles would rapidly coalesce into the 0.1 to 3 μm range, roughly consistent with the wellstudied PM2.5. For comparison, the EPA's National Ambient Air Quality standard for PM2.5 is 0.012 mg/m3 and as of 2017, the highest PM2.5 concentrations in Asia are typically around 0.3 to 1 mg/m3 .
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#### Current American/COVID vaccine I.P. provide the perfect climate for innovation

Wilbur 21 – Tom Wilbur is Director of Public Affairs at PhRMA focusing on message development and opinion research. Prior to joining PhRMA in 2019, Tom worked on Capitol Hill and on political campaigns for nearly a decade, most recently responsible for communications, campaigns and strategy for U.S. Rep. Fred Upton and the House Energy and Commerce Committee. Tom is a proud Michigander and outside of the virtual office enjoys reading, running, hiking, golfing, and spending time with friends and family; February 12, 2021; “The latest: What they are saying: Intellectual property protections vital to COVID-19 research, development and manufacturing”; <https://catalyst.phrma.org/the-latest-what-they-are-saying-intellectual-property-protections-vital-to-covid-19-research-development-and-manufacturing> //advay

Strong and reliable IP protections – including patents – have supported America’s robust innovation ecosystem by promoting discovery, development, affordability and access to new treatments and cures. As our industry continues to expand vaccine production and deliver medicines to patients in need, reliable IP protections have been critical in supporting multiple research and development and manufacturing ramp-ups on COVID-19 vaccines and therapeutics. Innovators need strong and reliable IP protections to research, develop and manufacture new therapeutics and vaccines that will improve patients’ lives during the current pandemic and beyond.

Experts continue to highlight the importance of strong IP protections that encourage innovators to develop and produce COVID-19 solutions. Here are some of their thoughts:

“Consider…the multiple COVID-19 vaccines that were developed in less than a year, but are based on decades of research and countless inventions in dozens of scientific and technology disciplines. The importance of our nation’s consistent support of such creativity over time is more evident now than ever…Our intellectual property system — born from our Constitution and steeped in our history — is strong and it supports our nation’s innovators who are more creative and more capable than they have ever been.” – Andrei Iancu, then-Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office

#### Lack of I.P. protections wreck the U.S. economy and R.O.I. because no one wants to innovate anymore

Wilbur 21 – Tom Wilbur is Director of Public Affairs at PhRMA focusing on message development and opinion research. Prior to joining PhRMA in 2019, Tom worked on Capitol Hill and on political campaigns for nearly a decade, most recently responsible for communications, campaigns and strategy for U.S. Rep. Fred Upton and the House Energy and Commerce Committee. Tom is a proud Michigander and outside of the virtual office enjoys reading, running, hiking, golfing, and spending time with friends and family; February 12, 2021; “The latest: What they are saying: Intellectual property protections vital to COVID-19 research, development and manufacturing”; <https://catalyst.phrma.org/the-latest-what-they-are-saying-intellectual-property-protections-vital-to-covid-19-research-development-and-manufacturing> //advay

“Of all of the ways to improve access to critical medication or vaccines, elimination of intellectual property rights is one of the worst. Our intellectual property system is designed to reward research and development innovation. Tampering with that sends a chilling signal about the rewards of corporate funding of the development and manufacture of new drugs, and tears down a system that has allowed the U.S. government to realize an enormous *return on its investment* into biomedical research.” – Jim Sailer, executive director of the Population Council’s Center for Biomedical Research, in The New York Times

“The role and importance of intellectual property standards have never been more apparent than during this global pandemic. The ecosystem for innovation spans basic scientific research, applied science, product development and testing, and commercialization… The role of intellectual property laws in this ecosystem is to enable those investments by transparently and predictably assigning rights to the breakthroughs that result at each respective phase of the innovation ecosystem. Those legal rights allow stakeholders to come to terms on contractual arrangements that enable collaboration by ensuring each party agrees on the value the others are bringing to the project. By doing so, intellectual property rights provide a vehicle to transform new technologies from useful knowledge into finished products that can serve an end-user, such as a treatment or vaccine for COVID-19.” – Patrick Kilbride, Senior Vice President at the Global Innovation Policy Center, US Chamber of Commerce, in Express Pharma

“At every step of drug development, intellectual property rights (IPRs) play a crucial role, supporting early research, bringing treatments through clinical trials, and getting them to patients…IP is the bedrock upon which today’s COVID-19 vaccines have been built… The IP system encouraged the rapid establishment of dozens of partnerships around COVID-19, with even commercial rivals prepared to cooperate and share capital and proprietary intellectual resources such as compound libraries…”– Philip Stevens, Executive Director of Geneva Network, and Mark Schultz, Goodyear Endowed Chair in Intellectual Property Law at the University of Akron School of Law, in Geneva Network

America’s biopharmaceutical companies remain committed to ensuring that treatments and vaccines developed for COVID-19 are availables to all who need them. For more information on the importance of IP rights, visit our IP page and stay tuned for our next IP Explained post.

#### Reductions are detrimental to medical innovation and disease prevention – spillover turns the aff

ABC 20 – America’s Biopharmaceutical Companies are a consortium of companies dedicated to driving innovation and collaborating to prevent disease. America's Biopharmaceutical Companies go boldly into the search for new treatments and cures, everyday. They are pioneers in innovation, ushering in a new era of treaments for patients; “How Intellectual Property Protections Spur Innovation”; 2020; <https://innovation.org/en/about-us/commitment/innovation-fragility/world-ip-day-intellectual-property-protections-spur-innovation> //advay

\*\*this ev also turns their soft left args – it indicates protections reduce healthcare spending which provides an external N.B. to the squo

As America’s biopharmaceutical companies work around the clock to develop solutions to help diagnose and treat those with COVID-19, a disease caused by a novel strain of coronavirus, the importance of a robust innovation ecosystem is at the forefront of our minds. Intellectual property (IP) protections help lay the foundation for this ecosystem, both in the U.S. and across the globe.

IP and the New Era of Medicine: Our intellectual property system in the United States promotes competition and is the foundation for breakthrough treatments and cures for patients. Government organizations like the National Institutes of Health (NIH) perform limited research; however, most of the research and development spending comes from biopharmaceutical manufacturers, which are unique in the substantial risk they take on. Because of a competitive U.S. patent system, biopharmaceutical innovators are willing to invest more than any other industry in R&D and bring forward medical advances critical to addressing some of our most challenging diseases.

Our intellectual property system in the United States promotes competition and is the foundation for breakthrough treatments and cures for patients.

The Importance of IP Protections: IP protections give innovators certainty that their proprietary inventions or products are protected from copycats, encouraging them to pursue that one idea that may work despite hundreds of others that may fail. At the same time, innovators publish the specifics of their invention in exchange for these protections so others can learn from their research and use it as a building block for future, competing discoveries.

Developing new medicines is a lengthy and complex process, and the work that goes into the initial discovery and patent application is just the beginning. A biopharmaceutical manufacturer must then demonstrate the safety and efficacy of a new treatment through rigorous testing that involves clinical trial data before a medicine can be made available to patients. By the time a medicine is ready for the market, it has typically taken on average $2.6 billion and 10 years—about half of the life of a patent.

The Value of IP Protections in the United States: In the U.S., IP protections help support more treatment options and generic alternatives, lower long-term health care costs, and Americans living longer, healthier lives. In fact, our IP system strikes a balance between promoting innovation and meeting the needs of patients who rely on breakthrough treatments and cures. In the last three years alone, 150 new treatments and cures have been approved, and over 3,000 generic alternatives have been approved or are on the road to approval. Today, more than 90% of drug prescriptions are filled with generics—up from 19% 35 years ago.

Additionally, America’s biopharmaceutical industry is a major contributor to the nation’s R&D economy and helps keep America at the forefront of advanced technology development. The industry ranks first among all U.S. manufacturing industries in terms of R&D dollars invested per employee and is responsible for about one out of every six dollars spent on R&D by U.S. businesses.

Today, 90% of new treatments and cures in the world come from the U.S., which is one of only a few countries where medicines are developed. Without reliable patent protections for inventions, patients would have access to fewer treatments and cures

Because of a competitive U.S. patent system, biopharmaceutical innovators are willing to invest more than any other industry in R&D.

The Role of IP Protections Around the World: IP is important on the international scale as well, as intellectual property systems differ from country to country. Many countries around the world are lifting IP standards to benefit their patients and consumers, to empower local inventors and to encourage more investment in innovation.

As people everywhere face the deadly COVID-19 pandemic and researchers race to develop and test potential solutions, we need innovation more than ever. Patents and other intellectual property have enabled a rapid response to this disease. They are facilitating the collaboration and partnerships needed to defeat the virus and to quickly scale up manufacturing and distribution of approved treatments and vaccines. To win this fight, countries around the world must continue to protect new inventions.

#### Anticipated economic results in nuclear war – especially for the U.S. and COVID

Tønnesson 15 [Tønnesson is a research professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in Norway and the leader of the East Asia Peace program at Uppsala University in Sweden.] “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace.” International Area Studies Review, volume 18, number 3, pgs. 297-311. 2015 // recut advay

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.

### Case

#### They’ve conceded to the authority of pain and pleasure

### Framing

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### Extinction comes first!

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

#### Biological death is the worst evil

Paterson 03 – Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island. (Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics, <http://sce.sagepub.com>)

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81 In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

#### *Extra -* Reject outdated responses - Extinction scenarios are much more probable due to Trump – Biden hasn’t done much better

Javorsky, 18

Emily Javorsky, Emilia Javorsky is a Boston-based physician-scientist focused on the invention, development and commercialization of new medical therapies. She also leads an Artificial Intelligence in Medicine initiative with The Future Society (TFS) at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government. “Why Human Extinction Needs a Marketing Department.” Xconomy. January 15, 2018. <https://www.xconomy.com/boston/2018/01/15/why-human-extinction-needs-a-marketing-department/>, RJP

Experts at Oxford University and elsewhere have estimated that the risk of a global human extinction event this century—[or at least of an event that wipes out 10 percent or more of the world’s population](http://globalprioritiesproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Global-Catastrophic-Risk-Annual-Report-2016-FINAL.pdf)— is [around 1 in 10](http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.pdf). The most probable culprits sending us the way of the dinosaur are mostly anthropogenic risks, meaning those created by humans. [These include](http://globalprioritiesproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Global-Catastrophic-Risk-Annual-Report-2016-FINAL.pdf) climate change, nuclear disaster, and more emerging risks such as artificial intelligence gone wrong (by accident or nefarious intent) and bioterrorism. A recent search of the scientific literature through [ScienceDirect](http://www.sciencedirect.com/) for “human extinction” returned a demoralizing 157 results, [compared](http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.pdf) to the 1,627 for “dung beetle.” I don’t know about you, but this concerns me. Why is there so little research and action on [existential risks](https://nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)(risks capable of rendering humanity extinct)?

A big part of the problem is a lack of awareness about the real threats we face and what can be done about them. When asked to estimate the chance of an extinction event in the next 50 years, [U.S. adults in surveys reported chances ranging from 1 in 10 million to 1 in 100](https://80000hours.org/articles/extinction-risk/#fn-2), certainly not 10 percent. The awareness and engagement issues extend to the academic community as well, where a key bottleneck is a lack of talented people studying existential risks. Developing viable risk mitigation strategies will require widespread civic engagement and concerted research efforts. Consequently, there is an urgent need to improve the communication of the magnitude and importance of existential risks. The first step is getting an audience to pay attention to this issue.

That won’t be easy. Our social media-driven digital echo chambers present us with topics we already care about, so if you don’t already think about existential risk, it is unlikely you’ll come across it. Furthermore, in today’s media environment, research data must compete with a sea of misinformation, spin, and a daily deluge of “breaking” headlines. We have understandably become desensitized to alarms, especially on topics that have been sensationalized like “extinction.” We can only hear “the sky is falling” so much before we stop listening.

To succeed at getting the message across about existential risks, we need to get creative in figuring out how to capture public attention. Just presenting data will likely not be sufficient. Nor do I think the answer is to hyperbolize the evidence, as that dilutes the credibility of the conversation. We need alternative strategies.

One solution is for creative people such as designers, artists, and marketing experts to get involved, as their toolkit extends beyond analyzing data. These people are uniquely equipped to translate information about risks into human wants, needs, values, and aesthetics.

Creative depictions of existential risks are common in science fiction and film but fictional doom-and-gloom isn’t usually designed to build public outcry for change or to spur policy debate. However, translating existential risks into something that people can experience first-hand can effectively engage an audience and entice them to learn more about a topic and, hopefully, into action.

The power of such a personal, creative experience hit home with me at a dinner I attended late last year at the [World Frontiers Forum](https://www.worldfrontiersforum.org/). The dinner, called The Last Supper, was hosted by Sam Kass, a former White House chef, with a menu created by Carolina Curtin of Café ArtScience, a restaurant in Cambridge, MA. The meal featured ingredients that will likely not be available to future generations due to climate change. I was shocked to see coffee and chocolate included in this lineup of endangered ingredients. For me, these aren’t even ingredients, they’re vital food groups. The abstract concept of “climate change” was converted into a direct impact on my basic needs and desires. Imagine if every Chipotle had menu items marked that would not be available in 2075? X’s on a world map showing the areas that will no longer be able to produce your favorite Starbucks single origin brew? The message gets you thinking, and wanting to learn more.

The risk of “AI gone wrong” was similarly translated into a fun, interactive activity thanks to the creativity of game designer Frank Lantz, director of the NYU Game Center. Last year, he released an addictive video game he designed called “[Universal Paperclips](http://www.decisionproblem.com/paperclips/),” which was inspired by an AI thought experiment from Oxford philosopher Nick Bostrom. The game explores in a frightening and engaging way how programming a super-intelligent AI to do a seemingly benign task, making as many paperclips as possible, could lead to the destruction of the universe.

Another striking example is the work of Dan Borelli of Harvard’s Graduate School of Design. He led an art-based project at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Nyanza Superfund site in his hometown of Ashland, MA, where a chemical dye manufacturing plant contaminated the groundwater and soil for years up until the 1970s. [Borelli placed colored filters on streetlights](http://www.ashlandnyanzaproject.com/thestreetlights/) that corresponded to the contamination levels in that area. Imagine driving through a town where streetlamps eerily change color, from red and orange to blue and purple. You’re likely curious and concerned once you realize the meaning.

Likely the strongest case for creativity as a tool to spur meaningful change is the effort of Tesla. The company’s creative expression comes in the form of beautiful and desirable products that also mitigate climate change risk. Tesla has shaped the future of sustainable transportation by introducing electric cars that are aesthetically and functionally superior to most fossil fuel-based models. Yes, consumers who already care about climate change will want to purchase the product, but others will want cool, sexy cars regardless of the benefits to humanity. By repositioning electric vehicles as high-end products, Tesla managed to increase awareness and put sustainable transportation on the map as a societal value.

While creativity may be able to open the door to curiosity, it must be connected to accurate information and opportunities for actionable change. Although it’s not looking good for our species, there are many ways to intervene and help prevent threats from becoming reality. We can pressure governments to enact policy changes (nuclear disarmament treaties), support triple-bottom line companies (which value environmental and social impact, not just the financial bottom line), invest in technical solutions (novel antibiotics and green energy), divest from companies contributing to risks (fossil fuels), and donate to organizations that are mitigating specific risks ([Machine Intelligence Research Institute](https://intelligence.org/)) and existential risks ([Future of Life Institute](https://futureoflife.org/) and [Future of Humanity Institute](https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/)). Employing creativity to raise awareness of existential risks is a vital strategy for engaging new audiences and shifting the tides towards learning and action. The future of our species depends on it.

### Advantage

#### **No solvency – implementation would be extremely vague, financially devastating, and faces numerous barriers**

Sauer 21 [Hans Sauer is Deputy General Counsel and Vice President for Intellectual Property for the Biotechnology Innovation Organization (BIO), a major trade association representing more than 1,000 biotechnology companies from the medical, agricultural, environmental, and industrial sectors. Mr. Sauer holds a M.S. degree in biology from the University of Ulm in his native Germany, a Ph.D. in neuroscience from the University of Lund, Sweden, and a J.D. degree from Georgetown University Law Center, where he serves as adjunct professor.] April 19, 2021, “Waiving IP Rights During Times of COVID: A ‘False Good Idea’,” IPWatchdog, <https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/04/19/waiving-ip-rights-during-times-of-covid-a-false-good-idea/id=132399/>, VM

“It should be clear from the foregoing that there are many practical problems with this proposal: Even if it were to pass out of the WTO, the waiver would still have to be implemented under the national laws of the WTO member countries. No explanation has been provided as to how up to 164 countries would be expected to quickly amend multiple statutes in their legal codes, or which form these amendments would take. Curiously, close to half of the waiver-supporting countries are already exempt from TRIPS anyway, and are effectively demanding to be free of rules that don’t apply to them. The most likely result of the proposed waiver would be a chaotic global patchwork of national laws that would linger at various stages of national implementation for years after the end of the pandemic. Due to the breadth and vagueness of the proposal, it would be impossible for IP rightholders to understand which products or services would lose IP protection in which country, or for how long – and little faith can be had in assurances that a waiver would be targeted and time-limited. Especially with regard to the critical category of trade secret or proprietary information, manufacturing know-how, clinical regulatory data packages and proprietary cell lines and other biological materials that are proposed to be shared, the waiver would in no way be time-limited. Proprietary information and materials cannot be un-disclosed or un-shared once they have been made public; they would simply lose their protection forever. One wonders whether Congressional proponents of the TRIPS Waiver have given any thought as to how it could be implemented in U.S. law. There is no mechanism in U.S. law for simply waiving vested IP rights. Amendments to the federal patent, copyright, food and drug, and other federal statutes would need to be attempted; trade secret protections under 50 state laws overridden; and the waiver’s interference with the IP and confidentiality provisions of myriad existing private contracts would need to be sorted out. As a result, the Federal Government would have to assume unforeseeable and potentially colossal financial liability. And because the waiver is intended for the benefit of foreign developing nations, the legality of any attempt at U.S. domestic implementation would be doubtful, as Congress has no authority to expropriate U.S. property to benefit foreign countries. It is of course possible that Congressional proponents of the waiver are merely engaging in virtue-signaling, without any intention of ever implementing anything. But nonetheless, the waiver is certain to invite similar legislative train wrecks in other countries that aspire to the rule of law, and it is perplexing how little forethought seems to have gone into the proposal.”

#### Vaccine development is **too complex** and goals are impossible to be met within a few months.

Sauer 21 [Hans Sauer is Deputy General Counsel and Vice President for Intellectual Property for the Biotechnology Innovation Organization (BIO), a major trade association representing more than 1,000 biotechnology companies from the medical, agricultural, environmental, and industrial sectors. Mr. Sauer holds a M.S. degree in biology from the University of Ulm in his native Germany, a Ph.D. in neuroscience from the University of Lund, Sweden, and a J.D. degree from Georgetown University Law Center, where he serves as adjunct professor.] April 19, 2021, “Waiving IP Rights During Times of COVID: A ‘False Good Idea’,” IPWatchdog, <https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/04/19/waiving-ip-rights-during-times-of-covid-a-false-good-idea/id=132399/>, VM

“To begin with, one would think, the burden of establishing the need for such an extreme and disruptive measure should be on its proponents. Yet, in the face of unprecedented progress towards COVID vaccines, tests and treatments in record time, the waiver proponents can point to no credible instances in which IP has in fact hindered the development or production of COVID-19 countermeasures. Readers should judge for themselves by perusing the joint South African/Indian TRIPS Council submission purporting to demonstrate such IP barriers. Even cursory inspection shows that this proof consists of a number of pending patent applications, a handful of patents that haven’t been asserted, a few statements by politicians, and historical narratives having nothing to do with COVID-19. There have been a few instances of patent litigation, but none to block or delay COVID products. Interestingly, royalty-free licenses by drug originators to dozens of manufacturers in developing countries are counted as IP barriers to access. Perhaps recognizing the lack of affirmative proof supporting the need for a COVID IP waiver, proponents are increasingly trying to shift the burden to those who oppose the waiver, maybe best exemplified by World Health Organization Director General Tedros Ghebreyesus’ stance: “if not now, then when would a WTO waiver ever be justified?” Yet this is a poor substitute for an actual rationale, especially when the TRIPS Agreement and its addenda are already replete with IP flexibilities that have been justified for both national and multilateral use on the ground that they will be necessary in a public health emergency. The same proponents who have for decades with significant traction argued for an ever-growing expansion of these flexibilities now say that it is not worth even trying to use them; only the effective abrogation of all IP rights in relation to COVID-19 would be a quick enough measure to deal with the present crisis while it lasts. However, the proposed blanket suspension of IP rights is no quick fix for the pandemic, as it is unlikely to accelerate the delivery of COVID-19 vaccines. Waiver proponents have been unable to document the existence of idle global COVID vaccine manufacturing capacity that could be unleashed by suspending IP rights. Existing capacity to produce traditional vaccines with conventional manufacturing technology simply cannot quickly or easily be converted to produce the advanced COVID-19 vaccines currently deployed. Thus, developing country manufacturers that currently make e.g. diphtheria, yellow fever, or tetanus vaccines, cannot simply be re-tooled to make the high-end mRNA or vectored COVID vaccines we are eagerly waiting for. Very different facilities will be needed, and getting these built, certified, and operational will take time, money, and precious expertise. Waiver proponents also seem to forget that someone must keep making the whooping cough, polio, MMR, and other childhood vaccines against diseases that kill more children in the developing world than COVID ever will. Current global need for non-COVID vaccines is estimated at 3.5-5.5 billion doses per year, and those who talk about using existing capacity must realize that we cannot convert current manufacturing away from these critically-important products. On top of that, an estimated 14 billion doses of COVID vaccines will be needed globally. As GAVI – The Vaccine Alliance explains, it was always clear that demand for COVID vaccines would be high, immediate, and impossible to meet in the short term. This is no fault of the IP system. Vaccine manufacturing processes are complex, require specific know-how and equipment, and just cannot happen overnight. Some COVID-19 vaccines involve new technologies, such as mRNA and lipid nanoparticle encapsulation, for which no large-scale manufacturing facilities or copious raw materials existed at the outset of the pandemic. The worldwide capacity to build or convert new plants is likewise limited, specialized manufacturing equipment is difficult or impossible to source, and none of this is or was ever going to be achievable within a few months as the proponents of the TRIPS waiver assert. Not even counting the time it takes to construct and equip a new plant, just the regulatory certification of a completed new facility takes several months before it can begin commercial production, and the manufacture and quality control of a single batch of COVID-19 vaccine takes 3-4 months before it can be released. Anywhere between 100 and 1,000 quality controls are done at each step of the manufacturing process. Those who argue that an IP waiver would enable the free flow of COVID vaccines within months are raising impossible expectations.

#### Waiver greenlights counterfeit medicine and increases vaccine hesitancy – turns case.

Conrad 5-18 John Conrad 5-18-2021 "Waiving intellectual property rights is not in the best interests of patients" <https://archive.is/vsNXv#selection-5353.0-5364.0> (president and CEO of the Illinois Biotechnology Innovation Organization in Chicago.)//Elmer Recut VM

The Biden's administration's support for India and South Africa's proposal before the World Trade Organization to temporarily waive anti-COVID vaccine patents to boost its supply will fuel the development of counterfeit vaccines and weaken the already strained global supply chain. The proposal will not increase the effective number of COVID-19 vaccines in India and other countries. The manufacturing standards to produce COVID-19 vaccines are exceptionally complicated; it is unlike any other manufacturing process. To ensure patient safety and efficacy, only manufacturers with the proper facilities and training should produce the vaccine, and they are. Allowing a temporary waiver that permits compulsory licensing to allow a manufacturer to export counterfeit vaccines will cause confusion and endanger public health. For example, between 60,000 and 80,000 children in Niger with fatal falciparum malaria were treated with a counterfeit vaccine containing incorrect active pharmaceutical ingredients, resulting in more than 100 fatal infections. Beyond the patients impacted, counterfeit drugs erode public confidence in health care systems and the pharmaceutical industry. Vaccine hesitancy is a rampant threat that feeds off of the distribution of misinformation. Allowing the production of vaccines from improper manufacturing facilities further opens the door for antivaccine hacks to stoke the fear fueling vaccine hesitance.

#### **That kills solvency.**

O’Reilly 21 [Eileen Drage O'Reilly, We’re racing to vaccinate before a “monster” COVID variant arrives, 5-6-2021,Axios,https://www.axios.com/covid-vaccination-monster-variants-9864a16b-2cd4-4e7f-9373-6393b769e22f.html, 9-4-2021 amrita]

**Slow global COVID-19 vaccination rates are raising concerns that worse variants of the coronavirus could be percolating, ready to rip into the world before herd immunity can diminish their impact**. Why it matters: The U.S. aims to at least partially vaccinate 70% of adults by July 4, a move expected to accelerate the current drop of new infections here. But **variants are the wild card, and in a global pandemic where only about 8% of all people have received one dose, the virus will continue mutating unabated.** "There's been hyper-accelerated evolution of the virus in recent months. The virus was kind of stable for 10 months, and then it started getting into this accelerated evolution. Now, the real question is, is there any way for it to get any worse?" — Eric Topol, founder and director, Scripps Research Translational Institute How it works: **Viruses mutate and selective pressure can favor those mutations that transmit easier in the population or that better escape human's innate immunity,** says Sarah Cobey, associate professor of ecology and evolution at the University of Chicago. "We're seeing both right now," she says. **It's unclear if SARS-CoV-2 will evolve in the long term as the type of virus that branches out into multitudes of variants that coexist or if it will have more of a replacement pattern**, Cobey adds. Where it stands: The CDC currently says there are five variants of concern and eight variants of interest in the United States. Two variants of concern — New York and California — may be dropping off and "on their way to extinction," Topol says. Three variants raise more worries — those originally discovered in the U.K. (B.1.1.7), Brazil (P.1) and South Africa (B.1.351) — partly because "they accrued many mutations, over a dozen, almost instantaneously," says Josh Schiffer, an infectious disease expert at Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center. **These three variants show varying levels of increased infectiousness, particularly B.1.1.7. Plus, P.1 and B.1.351 may be more able to evade the immune system or vaccination properties, Schiffer adds,** although more data is needed. The CDC is closely watching several versions of B.1.617, a variant first detected in India that may be linked to the surge in cases there now. "**We were lucky because we vaccinated ahead of the onslaught [of the U.K. strain]. Otherwise we would have been in trouble. That's the superspreader strain**," Topol says. **Schiffer agrees partial herd immunity is causing the level of new infections in the U.S. to drop despite the highly infectious B.1.1.7's prevalence**. "In the absence of vaccination, it's very likely that many places in the United States would look exactly like India right now with the new variants." "We're clearly seeing really pronounced signals of positive selection for increased transmissibility and what looks like some amount of immune escape," although this was not unexpected, Cobey adds. What to watch: **"Rapid vaccination is critically important. ... Even with partial protection you can achieve higher degrees of herd immunity," Schiffer says. "When I think of herd immunity, I don't think of it as an all-or-none phenomenon. I think of it as a dimmer switch." "The factories for generating new variants are areas that are getting hit very hard. If there is a new variant that's terrible — that ruins 2022 and brings us back to very dark times — it's almost a guarantee that it's percolating in an area of the world that's getting hit very hard now," Schiffer says.** "The one thing that could happen, but hasn't happened yet, is to have a superspreader variant like B.1.1.7 with very powerful immune evasion. ... Will we see that? I don't know. Hopefully we'll never see that monster," Topol says. Yes, but: The U.S. appears to be experiencing a drop in vaccination demand, despite the spread of variants. A new study in The New England Journal of Medicine shows the importance of people getting their second dose in fighting off the variants — but some Americans are not taking this step. And foreign nations are struggling to get access to vaccines, with the U.S. only now starting the process to fill in the vaccine diplomacy void. The bottom line: "It's just next to impossible to predict what's going to happen next," Schiffer says. **"I think the likelihood that we would have a variant that emerges that is worse than the ones we're dealing with now is much higher if you have a higher circulating number of infections**," such as what's happening in Latin America, India and Asia.

#### Restricting IP protections undermines innovation and profit margins – turns case by precluding vaccine distribution to developing countries.

Cueni 12/10 [(Thomas, Director General of IFPMA, chair of the AMR Industry Alliance, Industry Co-Chair APEC Biopharmaceutical Working Group on Ethics, MA in politics from the London School of Economics) “The Risk in Suspending Vaccine Patent Rules,” New York Times, 12/10/2020] TDI

It is unclear how suspending patent protections would ensure fair distribution. But what is clear is that if successful, the effort would jeopardize future medical innovation, making us more vulnerable to other diseases.

Intellectual property rights, including patents, grant inventors a period of exclusivity to make and market their creations. By affording these rights to those who create intangible assets, such as musical compositions, software or drug formulas — people will invent more useful new things.

Development of a new medicine is risky and costly. Consider that scientists have spent decades — and billions of dollars — working on Alzheimer’s treatments, but still have little to show for it. The companies and investors who fund research shoulder so much risk because they have a shot at a reward. Once a patent expires, generic companies are free to produce the same product. Intellectual property rights underpin the system that gives us all new medicines, from psychiatric drugs to cancer treatments.

In trying to defend these rights, the drug industry has made mistakes in the past that have lost people’s trust. More than 22 years ago, for example, a group of drug companies sued the South African government for trying to import cheaper anti-AIDS drugs amid an epidemic. With price standing between patients and survival, the suit, which the companies eventually dropped, was a terrible misjudgment. The current situation is not parallel.

Several major drug companies, including AstraZeneca, GlaxoSmithKline and Johnson & Johnson, have pledged to offer their vaccines on a not-for-profit basis during the pandemic. Others are considering differential pricing for different countries

. As of last month, four major pharmaceutical companies had already agreed to eventually produce at least three billion vaccine doses for low- and middle-income nations, according to one analysis.

In South Africa and India, pharmaceutical companies are already working with local partners to make their vaccines available. Johnson & Johnson has entered into a technology transfer partnership for its candidate vaccine with South Africa’s Aspen Pharmacare, and AstraZeneca has reached a licensing agreement with the Serum Institute of India to develop up to 1 billion doses of its vaccine for low and middle-income countries.

Companies can afford to license patents for free, or sell drugs at cost, precisely because they know that their intellectual property will be protected. That’s not a flaw in the system; it’s how the system ensures that pharmaceutical research will continue to be funded.

#### Skill disparities and trade secrets kill aff solvency.

Silverman 3-15 Rachel Silverman 3-15-2021 "Waiving vaccine patents won’t help inoculate poorer nations" <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/03/15/vaccine-coronavirus-patents-waive-global-equity/> (Rachel Silverman is a policy fellow at the Center for Global Development)//Duong

Reality is more complicated, however. Because of the technical complexity of manufacturing coronavirus vaccines, waiving intellectual-property rights, by itself, would have **little effect**. It could even backfire, with companies using the move as an excuse to disengage from global access efforts. There are more effective ways to entice — and to pressure — companies to license and share their intellectual property and the associated know-how, without broadly nullifying patents. The Moderna vaccine illustrates the limits of freeing up intellectual property. Moderna announced in October that it would **not enforce IP rights** on its coronavirus vaccine — and yet it has **taken no steps to share information** about the vaccine’s design or manufacture, citing commercial interests in the underlying technology. Five months later, production of the Moderna vaccine remains entirely under the **company’s direct control** within its owned and contracted facilities. Notably, Moderna is also the only manufacturer of a U.S.- or British-approved vaccine not yet participating in Covax, a global-aid-funded effort (including a pledged $4 billion from the United States) to purchase vaccines for use in low- and middle-income countries. It is true, however, that activist pressure — including threats to infringe upon IP rights — can encourage originators to enter into voluntary licensing arrangements. So the global movement to liberate the vaccine patents may be useful, even if some advocates make exaggerated claims about the effects of waivers on their own. We focused on covid. Now our other patients are suffering. One reason patent waivers are unlikely to help much in this case is that vaccines are harder to make than ordinary drugs. Because most drugs are simple chemical compounds, and because the composition of the compounds is easily analyzable, competent chemists can usually reverse-engineer a production process with relative ease. When a drug patent expires, therefore — or is waived — generic companies can readily enter the market and produce competitive products, lowering prices dramatically. Vaccines, in contrast, are complex biological products. Observing their contents is insufficient to allow for imitation. Instead, to produce the vaccine, manufacturers need access to the developer’s “soft” IP — the proprietary recipe, cell lines, manufacturing processes and so forth. While some of this information is confidentially submitted to regulators and might theoretically be released in an extraordinary situation (though not without legal challenge), manufacturers are at an enormous disadvantage without the originator’s cooperation to help them set up their process and kick-start production. Even with the nonconsensual release of the soft IP held by the regulator, the process of trial and error would cause long delays in a best-case scenario. Most likely, the effort would end in expensive failure. Manufacturers also need certain raw ingredients and other materials, like glass vials and filtration equipment; overwhelming demand, paired with disruptive export restrictions, has constricted the global availability of some of these items.