### NC – T

#### Interp: “Reduce” means net decrease—merely conditioning reductions isn’t topical.

Waxman 82—(Speaker of the House). Harry Waxman. Public Law 87-253, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982, 97th US Congress, Sept 8, 1982, Lexis

E) Prior to approving any application for a refund, the Secretary shall require evidence that such reduction in marketings has taken place and that such reduction is a net decrease in marketings of milk and has not been offset by expansion of production in other production facilities in which the person has an interest or by transfer of partial interest in the production facility or by the taking of any other action. which is a scheme or device to qualify for payment.

#### When authorized to ‘reduce’ the affirmative gets to decrease or eliminate --- changing the terms is not a reduction

Nebraska AG 73 (Office of the Attorney General of the State of Nebraska, 1973 Neb. AG LEXIS 25)//BB

In Commonwealth v. Dodson, 11 S. E. 2d 120, 176 Va. 281, the Virginia Supreme Court [\*4] stated that an item in an appropriation bill is an indivisible sum of money dedicated to a stated purpose. In State ex rel. Meyer v. State Board of Equalization and Assessment, 185 Neb. 490, 176 N. W. 2d 920, the court referred to and noted certain appropriation items. It also referred to five appropriation items, one of which was, for example, land acquisition (Medical Center, University of Nebraska) in the amount of one million dollars. This is certainly a clear example of an item of appropriation. It has been held that the power to veto item does not carry with it the power to strike out conditions or restrictions. Commonwealth v. Dodson, 11 S. E. 2d 120, 176 Va. 281. Under a Massachusetts constitutional provision which authorized the Governor to disapprove or reduce items or parts of items in any bill appropriating money the fact that the section relates solely to appropriation bills in conjunction with the word reduce shows that the expression "items or parts of items" refers to separable fiscal units and under such section, power is conferred on the Governor to reduce the sum of money appropriated [\*5] or to disapprove the appropriation entirely, but no power is conferred on him to change the terms of an appropriation except by reducing its amount. In re Opinion of the Justices, 2 N. E. 2d 789, 294 Mass. 616.

#### Violation: they only reduce during pandemics

#### Vote neg:

#### 1—Limits—there’s dozens of conditions that the aff could use to justify offsets in expansion: manufacturing, innovation, distribution, etc—makes NEG prep impossible.

#### 2—Ground—they don’t result in a tangible change to a world without IP Protections, unless the conditions are triggered—wrecks DA ground predicated on IPR good

### 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 key to sustain healthcare investments and 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.

#### Vaccine production is key.

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.

#### Future pandemics 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.**

### 1NC – CP:

#### Text: China should prohibit the transfer of humanitarian aid and vaccines to Latin America. China should cease all relations with Latin America.

### 1NC – Th

#### Interpretation---Debaters must link all offense relevant to the aff of the resolution back to a standard. To clarify, this means that debaters cannot run an a priori argument that affirms absent the standard.

#### Violation---

#### Standards---

#### 1] Clash---They encourage debaters to hide an a priori in their case, and then extend it in their next speech to win. This eliminates argument clash because debaters don’t have to engage on the substantive level---they can rely on blippy dropped arguments. Key to fairness because arguments must interact for the judge to fairly decide the round.

#### 2] Reciprocity---I’m at a 2-1 disadvantage---a prioris force me to answer one small layer of the flow before I can win an offensive argument, while you can just extend it easily and win. Reciprocity is key to fairness because debaters must be on an equitable level to engage in competition.

#### 3] Turn Ground---I can’t make any offensive responses on the a priori, and I am restricted to defense that might not be sufficient. Key to fairness because debaters must have access to offense at all substantive layers of the flow.

### Util

#### The standard is maximizing expected well being

#### States have no act-omission distinction – they’re responsible for everything in the public domain so every omission is an active implicit authorization. States lack intentions since policies are collective actions.

#### Actor-specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings.

#### Takes out util calc indicts since they’re empirically denied – they just prove util is hard, not wrong - and link turns them because the alt would be no action

#### Actor specificity—governments must aggregate otherwise it turns their framework because of the social contract governments have with individuals

Mack 4 [(Peter, MBBS, FRCS(Ed), FRCS (Glasg), PhD, MBA, MHlthEcon) “Utilitarian Ethics in Healthcare.” International Journal of the Computer, the Internet, and Management Vol. 12, No.3. 2004. Department of Surgery. Singapore General Hospital.] SJDI

Medicine is a costly science, but of greater concern to the health economist is that it is also a limitless art. Every medical advance created new needs that did not exist until the means of meeting them came into existence. Physicians are reputed to have an infinite capacity to do ever more things, and perform ever more expensive interventions for their patients so long as any of their patients’ health needs remain unfulfilled. The traditional stance of the physician is that each patient is an isolated universe. When confronted with a situation in which his duty involves a competition for scarce medications or treatments, he would plead the patient’s cause by all methods, short of deceit. However, when the physician’s decision involves more than just his own patient, or has some commitment to public health, other issues have to be considered. He then has to recognise that the unbridled advocacy of the patient may not square with what the economist perceives to be the most advantageous policy to society as a whole. Medical professionals characteristically deplore scarcities. Many of them are simply not prepared to modify their intransigent principle of unwavering duty to their patients’ individual interest. However, in decisions involving multiple patients, making available more medication, labour or expenses for one patient will mean leaving less for another. The physician is then compelled by his competing loyalties to enter into a decision mode of one versus many, where the underlying constraint is one of finiteness of the commodities. Although the medical treatment may be simple and inexpensive in many instances, there are situations such as in renal dialysis, where prioritisation of treatment poses a moral dilemma because some patients will be denied the treatment and perish. Ethics and economics share areas of overlap. They both deal with how people should behave, what policies the state should pursue and what obligations citizens owe to their governments. The centrality of the human person in both normative economics and normative ethics is pertinent to this discussion. Economics is the study of human action in the marketplace whereas ethics deals with the “rightness” or “wrongness” of human action in general. Both disciplines are rooted in human reason and human nature and the two disciplines intersect at the human person and the analysis of human action. From the economist’s perspective, ethics is identified with the investigation of rationally justifiable bases for resolving conflict among persons with divergent aims and who share a common world. Because of the scarcity of resources, one’s success is another person’s failure. Therefore ethics search for rationally justifiable standards for the resolution of interpersonal conflict. While the realities of human life have given rise to the concepts of property, justice and scarcity, the management of scarcity requires the exercise of choice, since having more of some goods means having less of others. Exercising choice in turn involves comparisons, and comparisons are based on principles. As ethicists, the meaning of these principles must be sought in the moral basis that implementing them would require. For instance, if the implementation of distributive justice in healthcare is founded on the basis of welfare-based principles, as opposed to say resource-based principles, it means that the health system is motivated by the idea that what is of primary moral importance is the level of welfare of the people. This means that all distributive questions should be settled according to which distribution maximises welfare. Utilitarianism is fundamentally welfarist in its philosophy. Application of the principle to healthcare requires a prior understanding of the welfarist theory as expounded by the economist. Conceptually, welfarist theory is built on four tenets: utility maximisation, consumer sovereignty, consequentialism and welfarism. Utility maximisation embodies the behavioural proposition that individuals choose rationally, but it does not address the morality of rational choice. Consumer sovereignty is the maxim that individuals are the best judge of their own welfare. Consequentialism holds that any action or choice must be judged exclusively in terms of outcomes. Welfarism is the proposition that the “goodness” of the resource allocation be judged solely on the welfare or utility levels in that situation. Taken together these four tenets require that a policy be judged solely in terms of the resulting utilities achieved by individuals as assessed by the individuals themselves. Issues of who receives the utility, the source of the utility and any non-utility aspects of the situation are ignored.

#### Ext first

Bostrom 13 [(Nick, Philosopher and professor (Oxford), Ph.D. (LSOE), director of The Future of Humanity Institute and the Programme on the Impacts of Future Technology), “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority,” Global Policy, Vol 4, Issue 1, http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.html] TDI

The maxipok rule 1.1. Existential risk and uncertainty An existential risk is one that threatens the premature extinction of Earth-originating intelligent life or the permanent and drastic destruction of its potential for desirable future development (Bostrom 2002). Although it is often difficult to assess the probability of existential risks, there are many reasons to suppose that the total such risk confronting humanity over the next few centuries is significant. Estimates of 10-20% total existential risk in this century are fairly typical among those who have examined the issue, though inevitably such estimates rely heavily on subjective judgment.1 The most reasonable estimate might be substantially higher or lower. But perhaps the strongest reason for judging the total existential risk within the next few centuries to be significant is the extreme magnitude of the values at stake. Even a small probability of existential catastrophe could be highly practically significant (Bostrom 2003; Matheny 2007; Posner 2004; Weitzman 2009). Humanity has survived what we might call natural existential risks for hundreds of thousands of years; thus it is prima facie unlikely that any of them will do us in within the next hundred.2 This conclusion is buttressed when we analyze specific risks from nature, such as asteroid impacts, supervolcanic eruptions, earthquakes, gamma-ray bursts, and so forth: Empirical impact distributions and scientific models suggest that the likelihood of extinction because of these kinds of risk is extremely small on a time scale of a century or so.3 In contrast, our species is introducing entirely new kinds of existential risk — threats we have no track record of surviving. Our longevity as a species therefore offers no strong prior grounds for confident optimism. Consideration of specific existential-risk scenarios bears out the suspicion that the great bulk of existential risk in the foreseeable future consists of anthropogenic existential risks — that is, those arising from human activity. In particular, most of the biggest existential risks seem to be linked to potential future technological breakthroughs that may radically expand our ability to manipulate the external world or our own biology. As our powers expand, so will the scale of their potential consequences — intended and unintended, positive and negative. For example, there appear to be significant existential risks in some of the advanced forms of biotechnology, molecular nanotechnology, and machine intelligence that might be developed in the decades ahead. The bulk of existential risk over the next century may thus reside in rather speculative scenarios to which we cannot assign precise probabilities through any rigorous statistical or scientific method. But the fact that the probability of some risk is difficult to quantify does not imply that the risk is negligible. Probability can be understood in different senses. Most relevant here is the epistemic sense in which probability is construed as (something like) the credence that an ideally reasonable observer should assign to the risk's materializing based on currently available evidence.4 If something cannot presently be known to be objectively safe, it is risky at least in the subjective sense relevant to decision making. An empty cave is unsafe in just this sense if you cannot tell whether or not it is home to a hungry lion. It would be rational for you to avoid the cave if you reasonably judge that the expected harm of entry outweighs the expected benefit. The uncertainty and error-proneness of our first-order assessments of risk is itself something we must factor into our all-things-considered probability assignments. This factor often dominates in low-probability, high-consequence risks — especially those involving poorly understood natural phenomena, complex social dynamics, or new technology, or that are difficult to assess for other reasons. Suppose that some scientific analysis A indicates that some catastrophe X has an extremely small probability P(X) of occurring. Then the probability that A has some hidden crucial flaw may easily be much greater than P(X).5 Furthermore, the conditional probability of X given that A is crucially flawed, P(X|¬A), may be fairly high. We may then find that most of the risk of X resides in the uncertainty of our scientific assessment that P(X) was small (figure 1) (Ord, Hillerbrand and Sandberg 2010).

#### Ethics must begin a posteriori--

#### Only a posteriori ethics can explain the influence of moral facts on the physical world – ethics must be understood a posteriori. Takes out empirical uncertainty because aggregation and pleasure unify experience

Papineau David [Professor of Philosophy King's College London], First published Thu Feb 22, 2007; substantive revision Tue Mar 31, 2020 https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/naturalism/#MorFac

Moore took this argument to show that moral facts constitute a distinct species of non-natural fact. However, any such non-naturalist view of morality faces immediate difficulties, deriving ultimately from the kind of causal closure thesis discussed above. If all physical effects are due to a limited range of physically-grounded natural causes, and if moral facts lie outside this range, then it follow that moral facts can never make any difference to what happens in the physical world (Harman 1986). At first sight this may seem tolerable (perhaps moral facts indeed don’t have any physical effects). But it has awkward epistemological consequences. For beings like us, knowledge of the spatiotemporal world is mediated by physical processes involving our sense organs and cognitive systems. If moral facts cannot influence the physical world, then it is hard to see how we can have any knowledge of them. The traditional non-naturalist answer to this problem is to posit a non-natural faculty of “moral intuition” that gives us some kind of direct access to the moral realm (as explained in Ridge 2014: Section 3). However, causal closure once more makes it difficult to make good sense of this suggestion. Presumably at some point the posited intuitive faculty will need to make a causal difference in the physical world (by affecting what people say and do, for example). And at this point the causal closure argument will bite once more, to show that a non-natural intuitive faculty would implausibly imply that some of our actions are strongly overdetermined by two metaphysically independent antecedents.

Moral non-naturalism has had something of a revival in recent years, with defenders including Russ Shaffer-Landau (2003), Ralph Wedgwood (2007), Derek Parfit (2011) and David Enoch (2011). Still, the challenge of accounting for our access to non-natural moral facts remains, and it is debatable whether any of these writers has found a satisfactory alternative to a causally problematic faculty of intuition. Perhaps the most developed suggestion is Enoch’s (2011) appeal to the indispensability of non-natural moral facts to moral reasoning, a line of argument that is analogous to Hilary Putnam’s case for non-natural mathematical objects, to be discussed in the next section below. But Enoch’s appeal arguably faces many of the same general objections as Putnam’s argument, as well as objections specific to the moral realm (see Leng 2016). In light of the difficulties facing moral non-naturalism, most contemporary moral philosophers opt instead for some species of naturalist view. We can divide the naturalist options here into two broad categories: irrealist and realist. Irrealist moral naturalists aim to account for moral discourse by offering naturalist accounts of the social and linguistic and practices that govern it, but without supposing that moral utterances report on moral facts with a substantial independent existence (Joyce 2015). By contrast, naturalist moral realists agree with moral non-naturalists that substantial moral facts exist, but seek to locate them in the natural realm rather than in some sui generis non-natural realm (Lenman 2014). Both these broad categories have further sub-divisions. Among the irrealists, we can distinguish explicitly non-cognitivist views like emotivism and prescriptivism which deny that moral judgements express beliefs (Hare 1952, Blackburn 1993, Gibbard 2003) from cognitivist views that accept that moral judgements do express beliefs but deny a substantial reality to the putative facts to which they answer; and among the latter cognitivist views we can distinguish error-theoretic fictionalist options which view moral judgements as simply false (Mackie 1977, Kalderon 2005) from projectivist options which hold that moral discourse is sufficiently disciplined for its judgements to qualify for a species of truth even though they do not report on independently existing causally significant facts (Wright 1992, Price 2011). Naturalist moral realism also comes in different varieties. In recent debates two versions have figured prominently; “Cornell realism”, which includes moral facts among the causally significant facts but resists their type-reducibility to non-moral facts (Sturgeon 1985, Boyd 1988), and “moral functionalism” which is happy to equate moral facts with straightforwardly descriptive facts (Jackson 1998). Any kind of moral naturalist realist needs to reject Moore’s open question argument. There are two alternatives here. One is to insist that Moore’s posited openness is relatively superficial, and that there is no principled barrier to inferring moral facts a priori from the non-moral natural facts, even if such inferences will sometimes require a significant amount of information and reflection. The other is to argue that the constitution of moral facts by non-moral natural facts is an a posteriori matter, akin to the relation between water and H2O, and that therefore Moore’s openness only points to a conceptual gap, not a metaphysical one (Ridge 2014: Section 2).

#### Practical identity isn’t binding or normative—it requires another higher level theory of what is valuable. Util is that since it says we operate on pleasure being valuable.

Fitzpatrick 5, William J (University of Rochester department of phil, PhD, UCLA). "The practical turn in ethical theory: Korsgaard’s constructivism, realism, and the nature of normativity." *Ethics* 115.4 (2005): 651-691. SM

What makes a particular conception of practical identity normative for an agent, giving her genuine reasons to do certain things? Kors gaard’s answer is the fact that this conception of identity is what is fulfilling the generic and inescapable requirement imposed by her humanity to have some such conception of identity. This is why the agent has reason to take seriously this conception of identity and the reasons bound up with it (unless she is prepared to replace it with some other conception of her identity, in which case the same point would then apply to that one): she must conform to it “because being human requires it.”68 The agent’s humanity is thus “the source of [her] reasons,” since it is the source of the necessity for her to take the reasons offered by her particular identity seriously—a necessity Korsgaard thus identifies with normative force, making those purported reasons genuine normative reasons for the agent.69 And if an agent’s humanity is the source of her reasons, then it is a normative form of identity and has value. How, after all, could something serve as the source of reasons if it did not itself possess normative authority and therefore value?70 Even if this were correct, however, so that “all value [thus] depends on the value of humanity” as Korsgaard claims,71 the fundamental question is how this would support premise 4 and hence the subconclusion in 5. As with Kant’s argument, there are two ways one might proceed here. The first parallels the first reading of Kant’s argument (Sec. V.A), taking the claims in steps 4 and 5 as strict necessity claims about the agent’s psychology—claims about what she literally must take to be normative, or must value. This is not an unnatural reading, inasmuch as the same language of necessity (i.e., what any agent must do) is used in just this sense in the first half of the argument, with no acknowledgment of any shift in the sense of the modal claims in the second half. But as we saw in the case of Kant’s argument, if this is how the argument is to be understood, then steps 4 and 5 are simply unsupported. Even if an agent’s humanity were indeed the true source of his reasons in Korsgaard’s sense, he needn’t take this to be so in order to take his particular conception of practical identity to be normative and thus solve the practical problem laid out in premises 1–3. Perhaps he has been convinced by reading Clarke that what makes his conception of practical identity normative and thus reason providing is the fact that it conforms to the “eternal fitnesses,” which is why he adopted it in the first place. Even if this turns out to be a false philosophical doctrine, it suffices as far as the purely practical issue is concerned, and he is able to exercise his agency by acting on considerations he takes to be reasons. So it has not been shown that an agent must take the normativity of his conception of identity to be rooted in the mere fact that this identity is fulfilling for him the need imposed by his humanity for him to have some conception of identity. The argument again stalls out.72 Consider, then, the alternative reading, paralleling the second interpretation of Kant’s argument (Sec. V.B), according to which the sense of the necessity claims shifts halfway through. On this reading, the argument proceeds as follows after step 3: 4 . In taking her particular conception of practical identity to be normative (i.e., as giving her genuine reason to conform to it), an agent treats her humanity as if it were a normative form of identity, serving as the ultimate source of her reasons. 5 . Therefore, an agent cannot help treating her humanity as if it were a normative form of identity, serving as the ultimate source of her reasons—which thus commits her to the normativity or value of her humanity. 6 . And since “valuing humanity in [one’s] own person rationally requires valuing it in the persons of others,” any agent is thus committed to valuing humanity generally and hence to the formula of humanity.73 As with the analogous interpretation of the earlier argument, there are two central critical points to press here. First, premise 4 obviously requires further support in the form of a theoretical claim about how things truly stand with regard to value and its source: S : An agent’s particular conception of practical identity could be normative (i.e., giving her genuine reason to conform to it) only if her humanity itself is a normative form of identity, serving as the ultimate source of her genuine reasons. Only if S is true can it be claimed that in taking her particular conception of practical identity to be normative an agent is treating her humanity as if it were the normative source of her reasons (see Sec. V.B). The real burden of the argument, then, rests on the defense of the value-theoretic claim S . Not only do we not find real support for this claim, however, but there are good reasons to be doubtful of S itself, especially in the present context. Ironically, if we were presupposing a realist framework, it might indeed be plausible that if some entity E is the source of reasons that have genuine normative force, then E must itself have some sort of normative authority and value. But there is little motivation to say the same outside of a realist framework, where all that has been established is that an agent’s humanity is the source of her need to make normative judgments and so of her need to treat certain things as normative reasons. Why must one’s humanity be deeply valuable in order to pull that off? And again, recall that Korsgaard herself rejects any metaphysical construal of the sense in which one’s humanity “confers value,” preferring to stick to claims about how we must value things.74 But this brings us back to the earlier difficulty, since it has not been shown that an agent strictly must regard her humanity as the source of the normativity o

f her identity and her reasons. All we now have are claims about commitment, which themselves depend on— and so cannot help to support—the claim about value dependence. The second, deeper problem is equally familiar from the critique of the earlier argument. While the first three premises set up a practical problem of agency and bring out strictly necessary conditions for solving it, what comes after are only weaker claims about what an agent commits herself to in the course of meeting those conditions in the first three premises. Thus, whatever its merits when considered in itself, assuming the above problems could be remedied, the purely constructivist derivation of the formula of humanity fails to accomplish what it is supposed to accomplish according to Korsgaard’s own conception of binding normative force: it does not establish the binding force of morality by showing how adopting or conforming to (or even acknowledging) the formula of humanity is practically necessary in order to solve the practical problem of agency with which we began. A conclusion about commitment and consistency is importantly weaker than a conclusion about practical necessity in the sense Korsgaard employs in characterizing normativity. If there is really a normative gap for the realist, then so far it arises for Korsgaard as well.

### Vax Diplomacy

#### US hegemony is dead – there’s no coming back

* COVID, economic downturns, nationalistic politics, security internationally
* Rise in other great powers to rival
* Weaker states can seek alternatives to US support
* Rise in right-wing networks vs liberal policies

Cooley and Nexon 6/9 (Alexander Cooley is the Claire Tow Professor of Political Science at Barnard College and Director of Columbia University’s Harriman Institute, Daniel H. Nexon is an Associate Professor in the Department of Government and at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, 6/9/2020, Foreign Affairs, “How Hegemony Ends”, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-06-09/how-hegemony-ends>) //EG

Multiple signs point to a crisis in global order. The uncoordinated international response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the resulting economic downturns, the resurgence of nationalist politics, and the hardening of state borders all seem to herald the emergence of a less cooperative and more fragile international system. According to many observers, these developments underscore the dangers of U.S. President Donald Trump’s “America first” policies and his retreat from global leadership.

Even before the pandemic, Trump routinely criticized the value of alliances and institutions such as NATO, supported the breakup of the European Union, withdrew from a host of international agreements and organizations, and pandered to autocrats such as Russian President Vladimir Putin and the North Korean leader Kim Jong Un. He has questioned the merits of placing liberal values such as democracy and human rights at the heart of foreign policy. Trump’s clear preference for zero-sum, transactional politics further supports the notion that the United States is abandoning its commitment to promoting a liberal international order.

Some analysts believe that the United States can still turn this around, by restoring the strategies by which it, from the end of World War II to the aftermath of the Cold War, built and sustained a successful international order. If a post-Trump United States could reclaim the responsibilities of global power, then this era—including the pandemic that will define it—could stand as a temporary aberration rather than a step on the way to permanent disarray.

After all, predictions of American decline and a shift in international order are far from new—and they have been consistently wrong. In the middle of the 1980s, many analysts believed that U.S. leadership was on the way out. The Bretton Woods system had collapsed in the 1970s; the United States faced increasing competition from European and East Asian economies, notably West Germany and Japan; and the Soviet Union looked like an enduring feature of world politics. By the end of 1991, however, the Soviet Union had formally dissolved, Japan was entering its “lost decade” of economic stagnation, and the expensive task of integration consumed a reunified Germany. The United States experienced a decade of booming technological innovation and unexpectedly high economic growth. The result was what many hailed as a “unipolar moment” of American hegemony.

But this time really is different. The very forces that made U.S. hegemony so durable before are today driving its dissolution. Three developments enabled the post–Cold War U.S.-led order. First, with the defeat of communism, the United States faced no major global ideological project that could rival its own. Second, with the disintegration of the Soviet Union and its accompanying infrastructure of institutions and partnerships, weaker states lacked significant alternatives to the United States and its Western allies when it came to securing military, economic, and political support. And third, transnational activists and movements were spreading liberal values and norms that bolstered the liberal order.

Today, those same dynamics have turned against the United States: a

vicious cycle that erodes U.S. power has replaced the virtuous cycles that once reinforced it. With the rise of great powers such as China and Russia, autocratic and illiberal projects rival the U.S.-led liberal international system. Developing countries—and even many developed ones—can seek alternative patrons rather than remain dependent on Western largess and support. And illiberal, often right-wing transnational networks are pressing against the norms and pieties of the liberal international order that once seemed so implacable. In short, U.S. global leadership is not simply in retreat; it is unraveling. And the decline is not cyclical but permanent.

#### No aff offense --- empirics prove no relationship between fluctuations in hard power, GDP, or grand strategy and violence

Fettweis 17

Christopher Fettweis, Associate Professor of Political Science—Tulane University, Unipolarity, Hegemony, and the New Peace, Security Studies 26.3, 5/8/2017

How does one measure polarity? Power is traditionally considered to be some combination of military and economic strength, but despite scores of efforts, no widely accepted formula exists. Perhaps overall military spending might be thought of as a proxy for hard power capabilities; perhaps too the amount of money the United States devotes to hard power is a reflection of the strength of the unipole. When compared to conflict levels, however, there is no obvious correlation, and certainly not the kind of negative relationship between US spending and conflict that many hegemonic stability theorists would expect to see. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on defense by about 25 percent, spending $100 billion less in real terms in 1998 that it did in 1990.68 To those believers in the neoconservative version of hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace,” argued Kristol and Kagan at the time.69 The world grew dramatically more peaceful while the United States cut its forces, however, and stayed just as peaceful while spending rebounded after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the military budget was cut under President Clinton, in other words, and kept declining (though more slowly, since levels were already low) as the Bush administration ramped it back up. Overall US military spending has varied during the period of the New Peace from a low in constant dollars of less than $400 billion to a high of more than $700 billion, but war does not seem to have noticed. The same nonrelationship exists between other potential proxy measurements for hegemony and conflict: there does not seem to be much connection between warfare and fluctuations in US GDP, alliance commitments, and forward military presence. There was very little fighting in Europe when there were 300,000 US troops stationed there, for example, and that has not changed as the number of Americans dwindled by 90 percent. Overall, there does not seem to be much correlation between US actions and systemic stability. Nothing the United States actually does seems to matter to the New Peace. It is possible that absolute military spending might not be as important to explain the phenomenon as relative. Although Washington cut back on spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. The United States has accounted for between 35 and 41 percent of global military spending every year since the collapse of the Soviet Union.70 The perception of relative US power might be the decisive factor in decisions made in other capitals. One cannot rule out the possibility that it is the perception of US power—and its willingness to use it—that keeps the peace. In other words, perhaps it is the grand strategy of the United States, rather than its absolute capability, that is decisive in maintaining stability. It is that to which we now turn. Conflict and US Grand Strategy The perception of US power, and the strength of its hegemony, is to some degree a function of grand strategy. If indeed US strategic choices are responsible for the New Peace, then variation in those choices ought to have consequences for the level of international conflict. A restrained United States is much less likely to play the role of sheriff than one following a more activist approach. Were the unipole to follow such a path, hegemonic-stability theorists warn, disaster would follow. Former National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski spoke for many when he warned that “outright chaos” could be expected to follow a loss of hegemony, including a string of quite specific issues, including new or renewed attempts to build regional empires (by China, Turkey, Russia, and Brazil) and the collapse of the US relationship with Mexico, as emboldened nationalists south of the border reassert 150-year-old territorial claims. Overall, without US dominance, today’s relatively peaceful world would turn “violent and bloodthirsty.” 71 Niall Ferguson foresees a post-hegemonic “Dark Age” in which “plunderers and pirates” target the big coastal cities like New York and Rotterdam, terrorists attack cruise liners and aircraft carriers alike, and the “wretchedly poor citizens” of Latin America are unable to resist the Protestantism brought to them by US evangelicals. Following the multiple (regional, fortunately) nuclear wars and plagues, the few remaining airlines would be forced to suspend service to all but the very richest cities.72 These are somewhat extreme versions of a central assumption of all hegemonic-stability theorists: a restrained United States would be accompanied by utter disaster. The “present danger” of which Kristol, Kagan, and their fellow travelers warn is that the United States “will shrink its responsibilities and—in a fit of absentmindedness, or parsimony, or indifference— allow the international order that it created and sustains to collapse.” 73 Liberals fear restraint as well, and also warn that a militarized version of primacy would be counterproductive in the long run. Although they believe that the rule-based order established by United States is more durable than the relatively fragile order discussed by the neoconservatives, liberals argue that Washington can undermine its creation over time through thoughtless unilateral actions that violate those rules. Many predicted that the invasion of Iraq and its general contempt for international institutions and law would call the legitimacy of the order into question. G. John Ikenberry worried that Bush’s “geostrategic wrecking ball” would lead to a more hostile, divided, and dangerous world.74 Thus while all hegemonic stability theorists expect a rise of chaos during a restrained presidency, liberals also have grave concerns regarding primacy. Overall, if either version is correct and global stability is provided by US hegemony, then maintaining that stability through a grand strategy based on either primacy (to neoconservatives) or “deep engagement” (to liberals) is clearly a wise choice.75 If, however, US actions are only tangentially related to the outbreak of the New Peace, or if any of the other proposed explanations are decisive, then the United States can retrench without fear of negative consequences.

The grand strategy of the United States is therefore crucial to beliefs in hegemonic stability. Although few observers would agree on the details, most would probably acknowledge that post-Cold War grand strategies of American presidents have differed in some important ways. The four administrations are reasonable representations of the four ideal types outlined by Barry R. Posen and Andrew L. Ross in 1996.76 Under George H. W. Bush, the United States followed the path of “selective engagement,” which is sometimes referred to as “balance-of-power realism”; Bill Clinton’s grand strategy looks a great deal like what Posen and Ross call “cooperative security,” and others call “liberal internationalism”; George W. Bush, especially in his first term, forged a strategy that was as close to “primacy” as any president is likely to get; and Barack Obama, despite some early flirtation with liberalism, has followed a restrained realist path, which Posen and Ross label “neo-isolationism” but its proponents refer to as “strategic restraint.” 77 In no case did the various anticipated disorders materialize. As Table 2 demonstrates, armed conflict levels fell steadily, irrespective of the grand strategic path Washington chose. Neither the primacy of George W. Bush nor the restraint of Barack Obama had much effect on the level of global violence. Despite continued warnings (and the high-profile mess in Syria), the world has not experienced an increase in violence while the United States chose uninvolvement. If the grand strategy of the United States is responsible for the New Peace, it is leaving no trace in the evidence. Perhaps we should not expect a correlation to show up in this kind of analysis. While US behavior might have varied in the margins during this period, nether its relative advantage over its nearest rivals nor its commitments waivered in any important way. However, it is surely worth noting that if trends opposite to those discussed in the previous two sections had unfolded, if other states had reacted differently to fluctuations in either US military spending or grand strategy, then surely hegemonic stability theorists would argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. Many liberals were on the lookout for chaos while George W. Bush was in the White House, just as neoconservatives have been quick to identify apparent worldwide catastrophe under President Obama.78 If increases in violence would have been evidence for the wisdom of hegemonic strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the relationship between US power and international stability suggests that the two are unrelated. The rest of the world appears quite capable and willing to operate effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise have precious little empirical support upon which to build their case. Hegemonic stability is a belief, in other words, rather than an established fact, and as such deserves a different kind of examination.

#### That means trying to fight back ensures counterbalancing and war

Adams 18 Gordon Adams, Gordon Adams is emeritus faculty from American University and a Distinguished Fellow at the Stimson Center. He oversaw national security budgets in the Clinton White House from 1993-97. “Beyond Hegemony And A Liberal International Order.” May 17, 2018. https://lobelog.com/beyond-hegemony-and-a-liberal-international-order/

America’s place in the world is experiencing an historic turning point. All the mumbo-jumbo about being the “exceptional” and “indispensable” nation, the natural “leader” of something called the “West,” the guarantor of some kind of international system of “rules” is finally being cast into the dustbin of history.

This moment is not just about leaving the Iran nuclear agreement, or even the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Paris climate agreement. It is not simply attributable to the unpredictable, childish impulses of the current president. Nor is it the result of Obama’s failure to enforce a red line in Syria, or “leading from behind” in Libya. It is not even about Bush’s invasion of Iraq with the goal of regime change, setting in motion the destruction of what little political stability existed in the Middle East.

Of course, it is about all these decisions. But in every case, those decisions, and even the critics of those decisions, have failed to realize how they have played into, helped cause, and now accelerate a fundamental shift in global realities—the centrifugal redistribution of power and influence in the international system that has brought to an end the “American century.” The United States has become just another power in a system for which it no longer sets or enforces the rules, if it ever really did.

Both political parties fail to cope with this reality. Democrats and liberals insist that Trump’s foreign-policy decisions threaten the “rules-based” international order America built and dominated. A simple change in leadership, they believe, can restore order and America’s primacy. Republicans [demand](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/global-opinions/wp/2018/03/24/john-bolton-wants-regime-change-in-iran-and-so-does-the-cult-that-paid-him/?utm_term=.68aa7b4e3cce) bellicose American assertiveness, believing that force and military strength guarantee that the world will behave. Columnists bewail America’s declining status, [arguing](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/global-opinions/trump-has-put-america-in-the-worst-of-all-possible-worlds/2018/05/11/ff68940c-5553-11e8-9c91-7dab596e8252_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.76f57dea9018) that greater iinvestment in allies and diplomacy, combined with military engagement might reverse the tide. Think tanks scurry to [define](https://csbaonline.org/research/publications/credibility-matters-strengthening-american-deterrence-in-an-age-of-geopolit) new national security and military policies that can put America back on top.

This debate is a circular firing squad. Both liberal Democrats and conservative Republicans are struggling to recreate a myth: that the US dominates the world by dint of power, values, wisdom, even God’s decisions. America, and only America, can bring order and security to the world. Any other option spells chaos.

Power Shifts

The latest foreign policy whim—withdrawing from the nuclear agreement with Iran—is the most recent nail in the coffin lid in which the myth is buried. Rather than restore leadership, withdrawing from the agreement simply accelerates the global rebalancing already underway, a tectonic shift that began with the disappearance of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War. The signs are everywhere.

In the Middle East, the power shift is palpable. The United States has treated Iran as a pariah since 1979, trying to stuff the ayatollahs back into some imaginary bottle, hoping that they will go away or be overthrown. This approach has failed, and the withdrawal from the nuclear deal will only make that failure more evident. Iran is a regional power, defending its interests, engaging other powers and movements inside and outside the region, such as Russia. US regime change in Iraq not only destabilized the region but helped usher the Iranians into this active regional role. The other influential countries in the region, particularly Saudi Arabia and Israel, will have to deal with this reality.

In addition to these three countries, Russia is also key to regional stability and instability. There’s no way of pushing the Russians out, short of direct conflict. Nor can Turkey be forced to comply with American policy. It is clearly asserting its own interests and influence in three directions at the same time: Central Asia and Russia, Europe, and the Middle East. The invasion of Iraq may have helped open this Pandora’s box. The US is rapidly becoming a marginal player in the chaotic security environment of the Middle East. In Asia, decades of US condemnation and containment of China have failed. How dare China rise? How dare China steal intellectual property, stifle democracy, arm its artificial islands in the South China Sea, develop a powerful military, mess in Africa (complete with a military base in Djibouti), and intrude into Latin America? And yet, to paraphrase Galileo, “they move.” There is a new, global, competitive player in the system, a reality the United States can not contain or reverse. That player is disrupting that lovely system of rules, acting without U.S. permission or approval. It is even creating new international institutions—an infrastructure development bank and a global trading infrastructure programs (the Belt and Road initiative) to which the US is not even a party. The balance has changed, permanently, and the rules are being rewritten, whether the United States likes it or not.

At the end of the Cold War, American power surrounded Russia, coopting its former satellites, provoking a Russian reaction. Today, the Russian government is, poisoning its citizens overseas, arming Assad, intruding on elections globally, stifling dissent and killing dissenters, and rebuilding its military. Confront Russia, condemn Putin, pretend that they are isolated, treat them with contempt and moral judgment, but Putin does not go away. He is asserting his view of Russia’s interests and Russia’s role in the world, like any great power is likely to do. No amount of US pressure, sanctions, or policy is likely to change that reality. Russia is consciously and actively rebalancing the United States, with some success.

American bullying and presidential rhetoric may have played a role in the apparent, but uncertain, willingness of the North Korean regime to put its nuclear program on the table. But if that program disappears, the putative Nobel Peace Prize may actually belong to President Moon Jae-in of South Korea and even Kim Jong Un, for seizing an opportunity. Even that regional balance and the key players are shifting.

Reckoning with the Shift

America has not been able to use its dominant military to prevent this evolution or restore order. Where it has been deployed in large numbers—Iraq and Afghanistan—U.S. military force has failed. War grinds on in Afghanistan with no light suddenly appearing at the end of the tunnel, despite the promises of generations of officers. Rousting the Islamic State from Iraq has not solved the internal problems of that unhappy country, which is still recovering from a US occupation. Special Operations forces in dozens of countries whack at terrorist moles only to find others arising in their place, stimulated by the confrontation. Order is not restored; the American rules are not being obeyed.

If the US fails to read global rebalancing accurately and tries either to bully the rest of the world or to “restore” the liberal international order, the entire world will find itself at an even more dangerous moment. Bullying will only accelerate the centrifugal trend. Asserting the superiority of an American “order” and American “rules” will no longer persuade other rising powers.

The rules will change with the rebalancing. Eliminating the Trump presidency will not restore the previous order. His actions are not an aberration, but an accelerant, spreading the fires that were already under way.

The challenge is to completely redesign US foreign and national security policy to fit with a world where America is just another power, competing and cooperating for influence. The United States must learn to play well with others in the global sandbox.

### Pandemics

#### Expertise, processes, bio samples, cell lines, distribution, and cost are all alt causes to TRIPs – only IPR can reliably scale high quality low cost medicine

Shultz and Stevens 1/14 Mark Schultz is the Goodyear Endowed Chair in Intellectual Property Law at the University of Akron School of Law, United States. Philip Stevens is Executive Director of Geneva Network., Geneva Network, "Why intellectual property rights matter for COVID-19 - Geneva Network - Intellectual Property Rights and Covid-19", January 14th, 2021, https://geneva-network.com/research/why-intellectual-property-rights-matter-for-covid-19/ - BD

The real challenges

IP has underpinned the research and development that has led to the arrival of several game-changing vaccines. But the challenge does not end there. Perhaps the biggest hurdle is manufacturing billions of doses or new antibody treatments while maintaining the highest quality standards.

There’s more to it than starting a global manufacturing free for all by overriding or ignoring patents. A spokesperson for Regeneron, a manufacturer of a novel COVID-19 antibody treatment explained to The Lancet: “Manufacturing antibody medicines is incredibly complex and transferring the technology takes many months, as well as significant resources and skill. Unfortunately, it is not as simple as putting a recipe on the internet and committing to not sue other companies during the pandemic”.

John-Arne Røttingen, chair of the WHO COVID-19 Solidarity trial, explains that technology transfer will be crucial to scaling up production, but voluntary mechanisms are better: “If you want to establish a biological production line, you need a lot of additional information, expertise, processes, and biological samples, cell lines, or bacteria” to be able to document to regulatory agencies that you have an identical product, he explains.

“Manufacturing antibody medicines is incredibly complex and transferring the technology takes many months. Unfortunately, it is not as simple as putting a recipe on the internet”

The TRIPS waiver, he says, is the “wrong approach” because COVID-19 therapeutics and vaccines are complex biological products in which the main barriers are production facilities, infrastructure, and know-how. “IP is the least of the barriers”, he says.

Then there is the problem of distributing the vaccines to billions of people in every country. Even with plentiful supplies, a range of issues need to be considered such as regulatory bottlenecks; supply chain, transport and storage; maintenance of the cold chain; adequately trained staff; data tracking; and vaccine hesitancy amongst the population.

The costs of the vaccine itself is only a small component of the total cost of delivering doses to millions of people. The UK, for example, has spent around £2.9bn on procuring vaccines, far less than the official estimate of £8.8bn to be spent on distributing and delivering them. Comparable costs will exist for all other countries, even if they are subsidised by Overseas Development Assistance. Even then, the combined costs of vaccination are dwarved by the other economic costs of the pandemic.

IP is part of the solution

Far from being a problem, IP has repeatedly proven itself to be part of the solution in fighting disease. It allows innovators to manage production scale-up by selecting and licensing technology to partners who have the skills and capacity to reliably manufacture large quantities of high-quality products, which they distribute at scale in low and middle-income countries. It would make no sense for IP owners to use it to withhold access, when they can profit from supplying all demand. IP licensing is the way this is done.

This is the model unfolding for COVID-19, with new manufacturing licensing deals such as those between AstraZeneca and the Serum Institute in India (1bn doses), China’s BioKangtai (200m doses), Brazil’s FioCruz, Russia’s R-Pharm and South Korea’s SK Bioscience. Collectively, such deals will see the manufacture of 2 billion doses by the end of 2021. The Serum Institute has also entered into manufacturing licenses with a number of developers of yet to be approved COVID-19 vaccines, as have several other Indian vaccine manufacturers. Many of these doses will be procured on a non-profit basis by new collective procurement bodies such as COVAX, for distribution to low and middle-income countries.

IP is important because it allows the innovator to control which partners manufacture the product, ensuring the quality of supplies, while maximising low-cost access for low and middle-income countries. It also allows the innovator to preserve its ability to recoup costs from richer markets, meaning the preservation of incentives for future R&D investment.

Voluntary licensing has worked well in the past, particularly for low and middle-income countries. A recent academic analysis of hepatitis C voluntary licenses published by The Lancet Global Health concluded that they have increased access to medicines at a considerably faster pace than alternative access models, by avoiding the need for lengthy patent disputes and bringing to bear inter-company competition and economies of scale.

But again, these licenses model were criticised by public health NGOs and other stakeholders, who called for the confiscation of IP rights via compulsory licensing. Time has shown such calls to be mistaken.

Conclusion

As of January 2021, there are three vaccines approved by stringent regulatory authorities with several more likely to follow in the coming months. Prices of COVID-19 vaccines vary between more expensive but complex to manufacture, and cheaper ones based on existing technologies. Companies are offering their vaccines at cost, with pooled procurement mechanisms such as COVAX ready to leverage their enormous purchasing power to drive economies of scale and bring prices down further for developing countries, many of which will have the cost of vaccination subsidised by Overseas Development Assistance.

Meanwhile, the existence of multiple vaccines means there is no COVID-19 vaccine “monopoly”, and minimal risk of premium pricing. In fact, there is a competitive marketplace in which manufacturers are incentivised to refine and improve their vaccines – vital given the new strains of the virus which constantly emerge.

Providing COVID-19 vaccines rapidly at scale is a pressing challenge for all countries but there is no evidence that overriding intellectual property rights will achieve more than the licensing agreements currently being forged between innovators and reputable vaccine manufacturers in countries like India and Brazil.

Manufacturing of COVID-19 vaccines is continuing at speed, and mechanisms are gearing up to ensure a rapid global role out. Forceable tech transfer and other forms of IP abrogation such as those proposed by India and South Africa at the WTO TRIPS Council would throw manufacturing supply chain planning, financing and distribution systems into chaos for little upside.

Instead of sowing division and creating major distractions at venues such as the WTO, opponents of IP should stop the rhetoric. The IP system has put us in a position to end the pandemic. We should allow it to continue doing its job.