### 1

#### 1] Interpretation - Reduce means permanent reduction – it’s distinct from “waive” or “suspend.”

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

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

#### Waiver is temporary.

Green 5/6 [Andrew Green (Devex Contributing Reporter based in Berlin, his coverage focuses primarily on health and human rights and he has previously worked as Voice of America's South Sudan bureau chief and the Center for Public Integrity's web editor). “US backs waiver for intellectual property rights for COVID-19 vaccines”. Devex. 06 May 2021. Accessed 7/31/2021. <https://www.devex.com/news/us-backs-waiver-for-intellectual-property-rights-for-covid-19-vaccines-99847> //Xu]

In a stunning reversal, U.S. President Joe Biden’s administration came out in favor of waiving intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines Wednesday. The move follows months of U.S. opposition that began under former President Donald Trump to a proposal from South Africa and India to temporarily set aside intellectual property rights around products that would protect, contain, and treat COVID-19. Its supporters have argued that the proposal, first tabled at the World Trade Organization in October and now backed by more than 100 countries, is necessary to expand vaccine production and overcome global shortages.

#### 2] Violation – the plan waives intellectual property protections temporarily, which is an indefinite suspension. That’s 1AC [insert author name].

#### [Pre-empting the We Meet] – Plan Text in a Vacuum is a useless guideline since words are contextually defined based on function – the only basis for determining Topicality should be if the implementation of the Plan as per their 1AC solvency evidence follows the directional meaning of the Topic’s intent – anything else allows the 1AR to re-contextualize what the Plan says forcing the 1NC to predict infinite 1AR spin since they’re not tied to their evidence.

#### 3] Vote neg for limits and neg ground – re-instatement under any infinite number of conditions doubles aff ground – every plan becomes either temporary or permanent – you cherry-pick the best criteria and I must prep every aff while they avoid core topic discussions like reduction-based DAs which decks generics like Pharma Innovation and Bio-Tech.

#### 5] TVA solves – permanently reduce COVID patents.

#### 6] Paradigm Issues –

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

### 2

#### Counterplan Text – Member states of the World Trade Organization ought to consult the World Health Organization on whether or not [The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections with the TRIPS Waiver for COVID-19 medicines.] The World Health Organization ought to publicly declare that their decision on [the Plan] will represent their future decisions on all intellectual property protections on medicines.

#### The Plan’s unilateral action by the WTO on medical IP undermines WHO legitimacy – forcing a perception of WHO action against Patents is key to re-assert it – they say yes.

Rimmer 4, Matthew. "The race to patent the SARS virus: the TRIPS agreement and access to essential medicines." Melbourne Journal of International Law 5.2 (2004): 335-374.

<https://law.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/1681117/Rimmer.pdf> (BA (Hons), LLB (Hons) (Australian National University), PhD (New South Wales); Lecturer at ACIPA, the Faculty of Law, The Australian National University)//SidK + Elmer

The WHO has been instrumental in coordinating the international network of research on the SARS virus. It has emphasised the need for collaboration between the network participants. The WHO presented the containment of the SARS virus as ‘one of the biggest success stories in public health in recent years’.206 However, it **was less active in the debate over patent law** and public health epidemics. The 56th World Health Assembly considered the relationship between intellectual property, innovation and public health. It stressed that in order to tackle new public health problems with international impact, such as the emergence of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), access to new medicines with potential therapeutic effect, and health innovations and discoveries should be universally available without discrimination.207 However, there was much disagreement amongst the member states as to what measures would be appropriate. The WHO has made a number of aspirational statements about patent law and access to essential medicines. Arguably, though, the organisation could be a much more informed and vocal advocate. Initially, the WHO did not view the patent issues related to SARS as being within its field of activities. The agency didnoteven seem aware of the patent proceedings, leaving individual research institutions without guidance. Spokesman Dick Thompson said: ‘What we care about is [that] the international collaboration continues to function. Patents, they don’t really concern us’.208 The director of WHO’s Global Influenza project, Klaus Stöhr, expressed his opinion that the patent filings would not interfere with the international cooperation on the SARS research: ‘I don’t think this will undermine the collaborative spirit of the network of labs’.209 However, he believed that, after the international network of researchers had identified the coronavirus, it was necessary to rely upon companies to commercialise such research. Klaus Stöhr conceded: ‘At a certain point of time you have to give way for competitive pharmaceutical companies’.210 On a policy front, the WHO remained deferential to the WTO over the debate over patent law and access to essential medicines, observing: Owing to the inconclusive nature of the studies conducted to date, and because of the effect that potentially significant price increases could have on access to drugs in poor countries, WHO is currently monitoring and evaluating the effects of TRIPS on the prices of medicines. It is also monitoring the TRIPS impact on other important issues such as transfer of technology, levels of research and development for drugs for neglected diseases, and the evolution of generic drug markets.211 In such a statement, the WHO appears diffident, unwilling to take on more than a spectator role. Such a position is arguably too timid, given the gravity of national emergencies, such as the SARS virus. The organisation could take a much stronger stance on the impact of the **TRIPS** Agreement on public health concerns. The WHO has since enunciated a position statement on the patenting of the SARS virus. A number of high ranking officials from the organisation have commented on the need to ensure that international research into the SARS virus is not impeded by competition over patents. Arguably though, the WHO **should not be limited to a mere spectator role in such policy discussions. It** needstoplay an active advocacy role in the debate over patent law and access to essential medicines. The WHO released a position statement on ‘Patent Applications for the SARS Virus and Genes’ on 29 May 2003.212 The organisation stressed that it had no per se objection to the patenting of the SARS virus: Some people have objected to the SARS patent applications on the ground that the virus and its genes should not be patentable because they are mere discoveries, not inventions. This distinction no longer prevents the granting of patents; the novel claim rests not with the virus itself but with its isolation, and likewise with the identification of the genetic sequence not its mere occurrence. Many patents have been issued on viruses and genetic sequences, though the appropriate policies to follow in such cases — particularly as genomic sequencing becomes more routine and less ‘inventive’ — remain matters of dispute.213 Furthermore, it recognised that public institutions could legitimately use patents as a defensive means to prevent undue commercial exploitation of the research: The “defensive” use of patents can be a legitimate part of researchers’ efforts to make their discoveries (and further discoveries derived therefrom) widely available to other researchers, in the best collaborative traditions of biomedical science.214 The WHO affirmed the need for further cooperation between research organisations in respect of the SARS virus: ‘For continued progress against SARS, it is essential that we nurture the spirit of the unprecedented, global collaboration that rapidly discovered the novel virus and sequenced its genome’.215 The WHO announced its intention to monitor the effects of patents (and patent applications) on the speed with which SARS diagnostic tests, treatments, and vaccines are developed and made available for use, and on the manner in which prices are set for these technologies. It observed: In the longer term, the manner in which SARS patent rights are pursued could have a profound effect on the willingness of researchers and public health officials to collaborate regarding future outbreaks of new infectious diseases. WHO will therefore examine whether the terms of reference for such collaborations need to be modified to ensure that the credit for any intellectual property developed is appropriately attributed, that revenues derived from licensing such property are devoted to suitable uses, and that legitimate rewards for innovative efforts do not impose undue burdens on efforts to make tests, therapies, and preventive measure available to all.216 It maintained that in order to tackle new public health problems with international impact, such as the emergence of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), access to new medicines with potential therapeutic effect, and health innovations and discoveries should be universally available without discrimination.219 The Assembly requested that the Director-General continue to support Member States in the exchange and transfer of technology and research findings, according high priority to access to antiretroviral drugs to combat HIV/AIDS and medicines to control tuberculosis, malaria and other major health problems, in the context of paragraph 7 of the Doha Declaration which promotes and encourages technology transfer.220 The WHO also considered a report on the emergence of the SARS virus and the international response to the infectious disease.221 It was ‘deeply concerned that SARS ... poses a serious threat to global health security, the livelihood of populations, the functioning of health systems, and the stability and growth of economies’.222 The Committee on Infectious Diseases requested that the Director-General ‘mobilize global scientific research to improve understanding of the disease and to develop control tools such as diagnostic tests, drugs and vaccines that are accessible to and affordable by Member States’.223 The Director-General of the WHO, Dr Gro Harlem Brundtland, **told the World Health** Assembly that there was a need to build trust and forge solidarity in the face of public health epidemics: ‘**Ensuring that patent regimes stimulate research and do not hinder international scientific cooperation** is a critical challenge — whether the target is SARS or any other threat to human health’.224 Similarly, Dr Marie-Paule Kieny, Director of the WHO Initiative for Vaccine Research, said: If we are to develop a SARS vaccine more quickly than usual, we have to continue to work together on many fronts at once, on scientific research, intellectual property and patents issues, and accessibility. It is a very complicated process, involving an unprecedented level of international cooperation, which is changing the way we work.225 She emphasised that patents and intellectual property issues and their safeguards can help rather than hinder the rapid development of SARS vaccines and ensure that, once developed, they are available in both industrialised and developing countries.226 C Summary The WHO should play a much more active role in the policy debate over patent law and access to essential medicines. James Love, the director of the Consumer Project on Technology, run by Ralph Nader, is critical of the WHO statement on ‘Intellectual Property Rights, Innovation, and Public Health’.227 He maintains that the Assembly could have addressed ‘practical examples, like SARS’ and cites the report in The Washington Post that notes that a number of commercial companies are investing in SARS research.228 The non-government organisation Médecins Sans Frontières has been critical in the past of the passive role played by the WHO in the debate over access to essential medicines: ‘As the world’s leading health agency, and armed with the clear mandate of recent World Health Assembly resolutions, the WHO can and should **do much more’**.229 The WHO should become a vocal advocate for public health concerns at the WTO and its TRIPS Council — especially in relation to patent law and the SARS virus. It must staunchly defend the rights of member states to incorporate measures in their legislation that protect access to medicines — such as compulsory licensing, parallel imports, and measures to accelerate the introduction of generic pharmaceutical drugs. It needs to develop a clearer vision on global equity pricing for essential medicines. The race to patent the SARS virus seems to be an inefficient means of allocating resources. A number of public research organisations — including the BCCA, the CDC and HKU — were compelled to file patents in respect of the genetic coding of the SARS virus. Such measures were promoted as ‘defensive patenting’ — a means to ensure that public research and communication were not jeopardised by commercial parties seeking exclusive private control. However, there are important drawbacks to such a strategy. The filing of patents by public research organisations may be prohibitively expensive. It will also be difficult to resolve the competing claims between the various parties — especially given that they were involved in an international research network together. Seth Shulman argues that there is a need for international cooperation and communication in dealing with public health emergencies such as the SARS virus: The success of a global research network in identifying the pathogen is an example of the huge payoff that can result when researchers put aside visions of patents and glory for their individual laboratories and let their work behave more like, well, a virus. After all, the hallmark of an opportunistic virus like the one that causes SARS is its ability to spread quickly. Those mounting a response need to disseminate their information and innovation just as rapidly.230 There is a danger that such competition for patent rights may undermine trust and cooperation within the research network. Hopefully, however, such concerns could be resolved through patent pooling or joint ownership of patents. Furthermore, a number of commercial companies have filed patent applications in respect of research and development into the SARS virus. There will be a need for cooperation between the public and private sectors in developing genetic tests, vaccines, and pharmaceutical drugs that deal with the SARS virus. There is also a need to reform the patent system to deal with international collaborative research networks — such as that created to combat the SARS virus. Several proposals have been put forward. There has been a renewed debate over whether patents should be granted in respect of genes and gene sequences. Some commentators have maintained that the SARS virus should fall within the scope of patentable subject matter — to promote research and development in the field. However, a number of critics of genetic technology have argued that the SARS virus should not be patentable because it is a discovery of nature, and a commercialisation of life. There has been a discussion over the lack of harmonisation over the criteria of novelty and inventive step between patent regimes. As Peter Yu comments, ‘[w]hile [the] US system awards patents to those who are the first to invent, the European system awards patents to those who are the first to file an application’.231 There have been calls for the requirement of utility to be raised. There have also been concerns about prior art, secret use and public disclosure. Representative Lamar Smith of Texas has put forward the CREATE Act, which recognises the collaborative nature of research across multiple institutions. Such reforms are intended to ensure that the patent system is better adapted to deal with the global nature of scientific inquiry. The race to patent the SARS virus also raises important questions about international treaties dealing with access to essential medicines. The public health epidemic raises similar issues to other infectious diseases — such as AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, influenza, and so forth. The WHO made a public statement about its position on the patenting of the SARS virus. It has stated that it will continue to monitor developments in this field. Arguably, there is a need for the WHO to play a larger role in the debate over patent law and access to essential medicines. Not only could it mediate legal disputes over patents in respect of essential medicines, it could be a vocal advocate in policy discussions. The WTO has also played an important role in the debate over patent law and access to essential medicines. A number of public interest measures could be utilised to secure access to patents relating to the SARS virus including compulsory licensing, parallel importation and research exceptions. The appearance of the SARS virus shows that there should be an open-ended interpretation of the scope of diseases covered by the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health. Important lessons should be learned from the emergence of the SARS virus, and the threat posed to global health. As the World Health Report 2003 notes: SARS will not be the last new disease to take advantage of modern global conditions. In the last two decades of the 20th century, new diseases emerged at the rate of one per year, and this trend is certain to continue. Not all of these emerging infections will transmit easily from person to person as does SARS. Some will emerge, cause illness in humans and then disappear, perhaps to recur at some time in the future. Others will emerge, cause human illness and transmit for a few generations, become attenuated, and likewise disappear. And still others will emerge, become endemic, and remain important parts of our human infectious disease ecology.232 Already, in 2004, there have been worries that pharmaceutical drug companies and patent rights are impeding efforts to prevent an outbreak of bird flu — avian influenza.233 There is a need to ensure that the patent system is sufficiently flexible and adaptable to cope with the appearance of new infectious diseases.234

#### WHO Cred key to Global Right to Health – medicine access is critical.

* Note the Bottom Paragraph is at the bottom of the PDF – I put a paragraph break to indicate it as such – no words are missing.

Bluestone 3, Ken. "Strengthening WHO's position should be a priority for the new Director-General." The Lancet 361.9351 (2003): 2. (Senior Policy Adviser, Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO))//Elmer

To meet these challenges, WHO must strengthen its resolve to maintain its **independence and lead its member states**, **even at the risk of causing controversy**. A meaningful example is the role that WHO can have in **ensuring access to medicines** for the world’s poorest people. WHO is the only global institution that has the **remit to drive this agenda forward**, yet has failed to do so convincingly. The new Director-General must support and reinvigorate the advocacy efforts of the organisation and provide a proper counterbalance to the interests of the pharmaceutical industry and wealthy member states. As the new Director-General takes office, they will face the dual challenge of **seeing that** the broadest possible public health interpretation of the World Trade Organization’s Doha Agreement on Trade Related Aspects on Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) **is not lost, and** of seizing an opportunity to bring about an international framework for sustainable and predictable tiered pricing of medicines. Without the active intervention of a public health advocate at the level of WHO, there is a risk that both of these initiatives **could founder.** Some people in positions of power still do not have high expectations of WHO or its new Director-General. But for the world’s poorest people, the overwhelming majority of whom live in developing countries, this person’s legacy could literally make the difference between life and death. Ken Bluestone Senior Policy Adviser, Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO)

New leader should re-establish WHO’s credibility The credibility of WHO’s advocacy of the right to health for all has been eroded in recent years. A large reason is WHO’s **failure to challenge the pharmaceutical** industry on access to medicines for people with HIV/AIDS and other diseases. WHO’s collaboration with the industry in the “Accelerated Access” programme on antiretroviral medicines sounds good. In fact, the programme has served as a cover for the organisation’s frequent acceptance of industry arguments for restricting treatment access. To re-establish WHO’s credibility, the new Director-General must lead the organisation to stand consistently with those most deprived of health services. Kenneth Roth, Executive Director, Human Rights Watch.

#### Right to Health solves Nationalist Populism.

Friedman 17 Eric Friedman March 2017 “New WHO Leader Will Need Human Rights to Counter Nationalistic Populism” <https://www.hhrjournal.org/2017/03/new-who-leader-will-need-human-rights-to-counter-populism/> (JD, Project Leader of the Platform for a Framework Convention on Global Health at the O’Neill Institute for National and Global Health Law at the Georgetown University Law Center in Washington, DC)//Elmer

The need for WHO leadership on human rights—and for global leadership on health and human rights beyond WHO—has always been present, yet has become ever more pressing. A reactionary, nationalist populism has been gaining momentum, particularly in the United States and parts of Europe, and some of its most disturbing features, such as xenophobia and disregard for international law and institutions, are surfacing elsewhere. Persisting health challenges—such as immense national and global health inequities, with universal health coverage and the Sustainable Development Goals offering some hope of lessening them—and growing threats such as outbreaks of infectious disease, worsening antimicrobial resistance, and climate change demand the type of leadership that the right to health entails. In this immensely challenging environment, WHO needs to become a 21st century institution that has the gravitas and credibility to carve a path through these obstacles towards global health justice. The next WHO Director-General, to be elected in May, must lead the organization there. The right to health can light the way ahead, with reforms to, and driven by, WHO. These reforms must develop an internal governance that is far more welcoming of civil society, with WHO member states significantly increasing contributions so work on the social determinants of health can expand, and with enhanced transparency and accountability. Furthermore, reforms are needed so that WHO leads on global health equity and human rights, including through national health equity strategies and, above all, the Framework Convention on Global Health (FCGH). The FCGH could help bring the right to health to the next level by capturing core aspects of the right to health, such as: 1) participation and accountability, setting clear standards for people’s participation in health policy-making at all levels, and establishing multi-layered health accountability frameworks with standards to which all nations would be held; 2) equity, including by catalyzing national health equity strategies—which must be developed through broad participation, itself a potentially empowering process—and advancing data disaggregation and more equitable financing; 3) financial resources, with global norms on national and international health financing responsibilities; and 4) respecting and promoting the right to health in all policies, from setting standards on health impact assessments—including participatory processes in developing them, human rights standards, an equity focus, and follow-up processes—to firmly ensuring the primacy of the right to health in other legal regimes that may undermine. From an earlier WHO treaty, the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, we know the power of international law to significantly advance health, with the transformative power of legally binding global health norms. As a treaty, the FCGH would increase political accountability and accountability through the courts, while helping protect health other treaty-based international regimes, such as trade. It would also be a bold assertion of global solidarity for global justice, as so urgently needed, “demonstrating that the community of nations are indeed stronger together.” One candidate for the WHO Director-General election, David Nabarro, has recognized the value and civil society support that FCGH has already received, and the need to further explore the treaty (mentioned at 1:46:38 mark). A good first step would be establishing a WHO working group on the FCGH, with broad participation, particularly from states, civil society, and representatives of communities most affected by health inequities, along with relevant international agencies. We see signs of resistance of the dangerous nationalist populism, from protests that persist and judicial checks on one of the administration’s vilest acts (an immigration and refugee travel ban, with its effects falling heaviest on Muslims) in the United States to the rejection of the far-right candidate in the elections in the Netherland. Such resistance can prevent some of the worst impacts on the right to health, from discrimination against migrants to cuts to programs vital for health. Meanwhile, let’s construct an edifice for the future of health and human rights, even as we stand against its destruction. WHO, right to health, and FCGH leadership ought to be a core part of that endeavor.

#### Populism is an existential threat.

de Waal 16 Alex de Waal 12-5-2016 “Garrison America and the Threat of Global War” <http://bostonreview.net/war-security-politics-global-justice/alex-de-waal-garrison-america-and-threat-global-war> (Executive Director of the World Peace Foundation at the Fletcher School at Tufts University)//Elmer

Polanyi recounts how economic and financial crisis led to global calamity. Something similar could happen today. In fact we are already in a steady unpicking of the liberal peace that glowed at the turn of the millennium. Since approximately 2008, the historic decline in the number and lethality of wars appears to have been reversed. Today’s wars are not like World War I, with formal declarations of war, clear war zones, rules of engagement, and definite endings. But they are wars nonetheless. What does a world in global, generalized war look like? We have an unwinnable “war on terror” that is metastasizing with every escalation, and which has blurred the boundaries between war and everything else. We have deep states—built on a new oligarchy of generals, spies, and private-sector suppliers—that are strangling liberalism. We have emboldened middle powers (such as Saudi Arabia) and revanchist powers (such as Russia) rearming and taking unilateral military action across borders (Ukraine and Syria). We have massive profiteering from conflicts by the arms industry, as well as through the corruption and organized crime that follow in their wake (Afghanistan). We have impoverishment and starvation through economic warfare, the worst case being Yemen. We have “peacekeeping” forces fighting wars (Somalia). We have regional rivals threatening one another, some with nuclear weapons (India and Pakistan) and others with possibilities of acquiring them (Saudi Arabia and Iran). Above all, today’s generalized war is a conflict of destabilization, with big powers intervening in the domestic politics of others, buying influence in their security establishments, bribing their way to big commercial contracts and thereby corroding respect for government, and manipulating public opinion through the media. Washington, D.C., and Moscow each does this in its own way. Put the pieces together and a global political market of rival plutocracies comes into view. Add virulent reactionary populism to the mix and it resembles a war on democracy. What more might we see? Economic liberalism is a creed of optimism and abundance; reactionary protectionism feeds on pessimistic scarcity. If we see punitive trade wars and national leaders taking preemptive action to secure strategic resources within the walls of their garrison states, then old-fashioned territorial disputes along with accelerated state-commercial grabbing of land and minerals are in prospect. We could see mobilization against immigrants and minorities as a way of enflaming and rewarding a constituency that can police borders, enforce the new political rightness, and even become electoral vigilantes. Liberal multilateralism is a system of seeking common wins through peaceful negotiation; case-by-case power dealing is a zero-sum calculus. We may see regional arms races, nuclear proliferation, and opportunistic power coalitions to exploit the weak. In such a global political marketplace, we would see middle-ranking and junior states rewarded for the toughness of their bargaining, and foreign policy and security strategy delegated to the CEOs of oil companies, defense contractors, bankers, and real estate magnates. The United Nations system appeals to leaders to live up to the highest standards. The fact that they so often conceal their transgressions is the tribute that vice pays to virtue. A cabal of plutocratic populists would revel in the opposite: applauding one another’s readiness to tear up cosmopolitan liberalism and pursue a latter-day mercantilist naked self-interest. Garrison America could opportunistically collude with similarly constituted political-military business regimes in Russia, China, Turkey, and elsewhere for a new realpolitik global concert, redolent of the early nineteenth-century era of the Congress of Vienna, bringing a façade of stability for as long as they collude—and war when they fall out. And there is a danger that, in response to a terrorist outrage or an international political crisis, President Trump will do something stupid, just as Europe’s leaders so unthinkingly strolled into World War I. The multilateral security system is in poor health and may not be able to cope. Underpinning this is a simple truth: the plutocratic populist order is a future that does not work. If illustration were needed of the logic of hiding under the blanket rather than facing difficult realities, look no further than Trump’s readiness to deny climate change. We have been here before, more or less, and from history we can gather important lessons about what we must do now. The importance of defending civility with democratic deliberation, respecting human rights and values, and maintaining a commitment to public goods and the global commons—including the future of the planet—remain evergreen. We need to find our way to a new 1945—and the global political settlement for a tamed and humane capitalism—without having to suffer the catastrophic traumas of trying everything else first.

### 3

#### China is using a lack of alternate COVID vaccines to engage in aggressive vaccine diplomacy and expand influence – the Plan’s increase of access to perceptively more efficacious vaccines devastates those efforts.

Zhao 4-29 Suisheng Zhao 4-29-2021 "Why China’s vaccine diplomacy is winning" <https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2021/04/29/why-chinas-vaccine-diplomacy-is-winning/> (Professor and Director of the Center for China–US Cooperation at the Josef Korbel School of International Studies, University of Denver)//Elmer

Chinese COVID-19 vaccines have been shipped to more than **80 countries** for market or emergency use. Among them, 53 countries received vaccines for free (including developing countries in Africa and some strategically important Asian countries such as the Philippines and Pakistan) and 27 middle-income countries paid for doses. Rolling out of vaccines to developing countries, Beijing has framed itself as **a solution to the pandemic** rather than the origin of the coronavirus. China’s advanced vaccine diplomacy stands in contrast **to the ‘me first policies’** of the **United States and the European Union**. With a shortfall in supplies, US and EU leaders have faced high infection rates and death tolls at home and feel the need to inoculate their domestic populations first. This has left the world’s poorest and most vulnerable people without vaccine supply and at risk. China has not faced these problems and can afford to send vaccines abroad. Just by showing up and helping plug gaps in the global supply of vaccines, China has g**ained ground** in vaccine diplomacy. President Xi Jinping pledged that Chinese vaccines would be provided as a global public good. But a large portion of Chinese vaccines are not free — some countries have paid Chinese vaccine makers. Still the absence of the United States and European Union from vaccine diplomacy **is not lost** on countries struggling to put shots in people’s arms. Many countries would prefer US or EU-made Pfizer and Moderna vaccines over China’s vaccines if given the choice, **yet they cannot access them**. These countries are desperate and have jumped at the opportunity to receive Chinese vaccines. Chinese companies are also more willing than their western counterparts **to strike licensing deals** to produce vaccines in foreign countries. For example, Indonesia has become a regional hub for Sinovac’s CoronaVac through its state pharmaceuticals company Bio Farma. The United Arab Emirates (UAE) chose Sinopharm because it was willing to conduct phase three clinical trials in the UAE and build native vaccine production capabilities. Sinopharm also arranged to manufacture its vaccine in the UAE for regional distribution. Beijing’s vaccine diplomacy involves propaganda to boost **perceptions of China as a generous and responsible power**. Chinese media has covered every delivery of vaccine shipment. The scene is set by a standard script. When a cargo plane lands, it is greeted by senior local leaders accompanied by Chinese ambassadors fawning over the vaccine cargo. Vaccine diplomacy has helped **increase China’s influence** and enabled it to capitalise **on new opportunities**. China has rolled vaccines out to participants of its Belt and Road Initiative (**BRI**) **and enhanced preferential access to jabs alongside investments in infrastructure and connectivity projects**. According to an April Think Global Health report, of the 56 countries to which China pledged doses, all but one were participants in its BRI. Naming it the Health Silk Road, vaccine diplomacy has provided a foothold for China’s pharmaceutical industry that has been plagued by scandals and low levels of trust at home and abroad. Making Sinovac and Sinopharm household names in foreign countries, China may change these perceptions. Although Chinese vaccine makers were among the earliest in the world to begin clinical trials and self-reported some key results, many have not published complete data in peer-reviewed journals. This has fuelled scepticism about their safety and effectiveness. Gao Fu, director of China’s Centre for Disease Control and Prevention, noted in April that Chinese vaccines were not as effective as hoped and mixing them was among the strategies being considered to boost their effectiveness. Some countries have been reluctant to greenlight Chinese vaccines. Singapore received its first shipment of Sinovac vaccines in February, but Singaporean regulators have not approved its use, moving ahead with using Pfizer and Moderna vaccines. Polish President Andrzej Duda spoke with President Xi about buying Chinese jabs in March. Yet Poland’s health authorities have recommended against using Chinese vaccines because of a lack of data. Concerns have also arisen about whether China’s production capacity is able to keep pace with an ever-expanding list of overseas customers and its domestic vaccination campaign. The Turkish government ordered 20 million doses of China’s Sinovac vaccine. But delayed shipments forced the government to repeatedly revise its vaccination timetable. Egypt purchased a total of 40 million doses of the vaccine from Sinopharm in January but had received only a tiny percentage of its vaccine order from China by the middle of April. This tension will intensify as China’s domestic demand for vaccines increases. China has continued with vaccine diplomacy in the absence of the United States and other Western countries. These countries should compete and cooperate with China to overcome bottlenecks in the global distribution of vaccines and ensure that all nations, particularly developing countries, receive the vaccines they need to finally beat COVID-19.

#### Waivers are a critical issue in the perceptual ineptness of America and the West.

Pratt and Levin 4-29 Simon Frankel Pratt and Jamie Levin 4-29-2021 "Vaccines Will Shape the New Geopolitical Order" <https://archive.is/OgDcA#selection-847.23-857.11> (Simon Frankel Pratt is a lecturer in the School of Sociology, Politics, and International Studies at the University of Bristol. Jamie Levin is an assistant professor of political science at St. Francis Xavier University in Canada.)//Elmer

While home to vaccines produced by the likes of Pfizer, Moderna, AstraZeneca, and Johnson & Johnson—all now household names and whose vaccines are considered more efficacious—governments of these states have demonstrated a **reluctance to supply doses** to much of the rest of the world at the expense of domestic vaccination rates. The United States and the U.K. have exported almost none, and the EU is clamping down. They have similarly been **unwilling to waive patents**, allowing for production of these vaccines where they are most needed. This suggests that the United States and the EU are slow to fully exploit the geopolitical opportunities of vaccine diplomacy or at least are not willing to do so with the same alacrity and **enthusiasm as other states**. That may change as time goes on, however, and the result will be worsened inequities within already inequitable trade relationships between these countries and the global south.

#### Chinese leadership solves existential threats.

Yamei 18 Shen Yamei 18, Deputy Director and Associate Research Fellow of Department for American Studies, China Institute of International Studies, 1-9-2018, "Probing into the “Chinese Solution” for the Transformation of Global Governance," CAIFC, <http://www.caifc.org.cn/en/content.aspx?id=4491>

As the world is in a period of great development, transformation and adjustment, the international power comparison is undergoing profound changes, global governance is reshuffling and traditional governance concepts and models are confronted with challenges. The international community is expecting China to play a bigger role in global governance, which has given birth to the Chinese solution. A. To Lead the Transformation of the Global Governance System. The “shortcomings” of the existing global governance system are prominent, which can hardly ensure global development. First, the traditional dominant forces are seriously imbalanced*.* The US and Europe that used to dominate the global governance system have been beset with structural problems, with their economic development stalling, social contradictions intensifying, populism and secessionism rising, and states trapped in internal strife and differentiation. These countries have not fully reformed and adjusted themselves well, but rather pointed their fingers at globalization and resorted to retreat for self-insurance or were busy with their own affairs without any wish or ability to participate in global governance, which has encouraged the growth of “anti-globalization” trend into an interference factor to global governance. Second, the global governance mechanism is relatively lagging behind. Over the years of development, the strength of emerging economies has increased dramatically, which has substantially upset the international power structure, as the developing countries as a whole have made 80 percent of the contributions to global economic growth. These countries have expressed their appeal for new governance and begun policy coordination among themselves, which has initiated the transition of global governance form “Western governance” to “East-West joint governance”, but the traditional governance mechanisms such as the World Bank, IMF and G7 failed to reflect the demand of the new pattern, in addition to their lack of representation and inclusiveness. Third, the global governance rules are developing in a fragmented way, with governance deficits existing in some key areas. With the diversification and in-depth integration of international interests, the domain of global governance has continued to expand, with actors multiplying by folds and action intentions becoming complicated. As relevant efforts are usually temporary and limited to specific partners or issues, global governance driven by requests of “diversified governance” lacks systematic and comprehensive solutions. Since the beginning of this year, there have been risks of running into an acephalous statein such key areas as global economic governance and climate change*.* Such emerging issues as nuclear security and international terrorism have suffered injustice because of power politics*.* The governance areas in deficit, such as cyber security, polar region and oceans, have “reversely forced” certain countries and organizations to respond hastily*.* All of these have made the global governance system trapped in a dilemma and call urgently for a clear direction of advancement. B. To Innovate and Perfect the International Order. Currently, whether the developing countries or the Western countries of Europe and the US are greatly discontent with the existing international order as well as their appeals and motivation for changing the order are unprecedentedly strong. The US is the major creator and beneficiary of the existing hegemonic order, but it is now doubtful that it has gained much less than lost from the existing order, faced with the difficulties of global economic transformation and obsessed with economic despair and political dejection. Although the developing countries as represented by China acknowledge the positive role played by the post-war international order in safeguarding peace, boosting prosperity and promoting globalization, they criticize the existing order for lack of inclusiveness in politics and equality in economy, as well as double standard in security, believing it has failed to reflect the multi-polarization trend of the world and is an exclusive “circle club”. Therefore, there is much room for improvement. For China, to lead the transformation of the global governance system and international order not only supports the efforts of the developing countries to uphold multilateralism rather than unilateralism, advocate the rule of law rather than the law of the jungle and practice democracy rather than power politics in international relations, but also is an important subject concerning whether China could gain the discourse power and development space corresponding to its own strength and interests in the process of innovating and perfecting the framework of international order. C. To Promote Integration of the Eastern and Western Civilizations. Dialog among civilizations, which is the popular foundation for any country’s diplomatic proposals, runs like a trickle moistening things silently. Nevertheless, in the existing international system guided by the “Western-Centrism”, the Western civilization has always had the self-righteous superiority, conflicting with the interests and mentality of other countries and having failed to find the path to co-existing peacefully and harmoniously with other *civilizations.* So to speak, many problems of today, including the growing gap in economic development between the developed and developing countries against the background of globalization, the Middle East trapped in chaos and disorder, the failure of Russia and Turkey to “integrate into the West”, etc., can be directly attributed to lack of exchanges, communication and integration among civilizations. Since the 18th National Congress of CPC, Xi Jinping has raised the concept of “Chinese Dream” that reflects both Chinese values and China’s pursuit, re-introducing to the world the idea of “all living creatures grow together without harming one another and ways run parallel without interfering with one another”, which is the highest ideal in Chinese traditional culture, and striving to shape China into a force that counter-balance the Western civilization. He has also made solemn commitment that “we respect the diversity of civilizations …… cannot be puffed up with pride and depreciate other civilizations and nations”; “facing the people deeply trapped in misery and wars, we should have not only compassion and sympathy, but also responsibility and action …… do whatever we can to extend assistance to those people caught in predicament”, etc. China will rebalance the international pattern from a more inclusive civilization perspective and with more far-sighted strategic mindset, or at least correct the bisected or predominated world order so as to promote the parallel development of the Eastern and Western civilizations through mutual learning, integration and encouragement. D. To Pass on China’s Confidence. Only a short while ago, some Western countries had called for “China’s responsibility” and made it an inhibition to “regulate” China’s development orientation. Today, China has become a source of stability in an international situation full of uncertainties. Over the past 5 years, China has made outstanding contributions to the recovery of world economy under relatively great pressure of its own economic downturn. Encouraged by the “four confidences”, the whole of the Chinese society has burst out innovation vitality and produced innovation achievements, making people have more sense of gain and more optimistic about the national development prospect. It is the heroism of the ordinary Chinese to overcome difficulties and realize the ideal destiny that best explains China’s confidence. When this confidence is passed on in the field of diplomacy, it is expressed as: first, China’s posture is seen as more forging ahead and courageous to undertake responsibilities ---- proactively shaping the international agendas rather than passively accepting them; having clear-cut attitudes on international disputes rather than being equivocal; and extending international cooperation to comprehensive and dimensional development rather than based on the theory of “economy only”. In sum, China will actively seek understanding and support from other countries rather than imposing its will on others with clear-cut Chinese characteristics, Chinese style and Chinese manner. Second, China’s discourse is featured as a combination of inflexibility and yielding as well as magnanimous ---- combining the internationally recognized diplomatic principles with the excellent Chinese cultural traditions through digesting the Chinese and foreign humanistic classics assisted with philosophical speculations to make “China Brand, Chinese Voice and China’s Image get more and more recognized”. Third, the Chinese solution is more practical and intimate to people as well as emphasizes inclusive cooperation, as China is full of confidence to break the monopoly of the Western model on global development, “offering mankind a Chinese solution to explore a better social system”, and “providing a brand new option for the nations and peoples who are hoping both to speed up development and maintain independence”. II.Path Searching of the “Chinese Solution” for Global Governance Over the past years’ efforts, China has the ability to transform itself from “grasping the opportunity” for development to “creating opportunity” and “sharing opportunity” for common development, hoping to pass on the longing of the Chinese people for a better life to the people of other countries and promoting the development of the global governance system toward a more just and rational end. It has become the major power’s conscious commitment of China to lead the transformation of the global governance system in a profound way. A. To Construct the Theoretical System for Global Governance. The theoretical system of global governance has been the focus of the party central committee’s diplomatic theory innovation since the 18th National Congress of CPC as well as an important component of the theory of socialism with Chinese characteristics for a new era, which is not only the sublimation of China’s interaction with the world from “absorbing and learning” to “cooperation and mutual learning”, but also the cause why so many developing countries have turned from “learning from the West” to “exploring for treasures in the East”. In the past 5 years, the party central committee, based on precise interpretation of the world pattern today and serious reflection on the future development of mankind, has made a sincere call to the world for promoting the development of global governance system toward a more just and rational end, and proposed a series of new concepts and new strategies including engaging in major power diplomacy with Chinese characteristics, creating the human community with common destiny, promoting the construction of new international relationship rooted in the principle of cooperation and win-win, enriching the strategic thinking of peaceful development, sticking to the correct benefit view, formulating the partnership network the world over, advancing the global economic governance in a way of mutual consultation, joint construction and co-sharing, advocating the joint, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security concept, and launching the grand “Belt and Road” initiative. The Chinese solution composed of these contents, not only fundamentally different from the old roads of industrial revolution and colonial expansion in history, but also different from the market-driven neo-liberalism model currently advocated by Western countries and international organizations, stands at the height of the world and even mankind, seeking for global common development and having widened the road for the developing countries to modernization, which is widely welcomed by the international community. B. To Supplement and Perfect the Global Governance System. Currently, the international political practice in global governance is mostly problem-driven without creating a set of relatively independent, centralized and integral power structures, resulting in the existing global governance systemcharacterized as both extensive and unbalanced**.** China has been engaged in reform and innovation, while maintaining and constructing the existing systems, producing some thinking and method with Chinese characteristics. First, China sees the UN as a mirror that reflects the status quo of global governance, which should act as the leader of global governance, and actively safeguards the global governance system with the UN at the core. Second, China is actively promoting the transforming process of such recently emerged international mechanisms as G20, BRICS and SCO, perfecting them through practice, and boosting Asia-Pacific regional cooperation and the development of economic globalization. China is also promoting the construction of regional security mechanism through the Six-Party Talks on Korean Peninsula nuclear issue, Boao Forum for Asia, CICA and multilateral security dialog mechanisms led by ASEAN so as to lay the foundation for the future regional security framework. Third, China has initiated the establishment of AIIB and the New Development Bank of BRICS, creating a precedent for developing countries to set up multilateral financial institutions. The core of the new relationship between China and them lies in “boosting rather than controlling” and “public rather than private”, which is much different from the management and operation model of the World Bank, manifesting the increasing global governance ability of China and the developing countries as well as exerting pressure on the international economic and financial institution to speed up reforms. Thus, in leading the transformation of the global governance system, China has not overthrown the existing systems and started all over again, but been engaged in innovating and perfecting; China has proactively undertaken international responsibilities, but has to do everything in its power and act according to its ability. C. To Reform the Global Governance Rules. Many of the problems facing global governance today are deeply rooted in such a cause that the dominant power of the existing governance system has taken it as the tool to realize its own national interests first and a platform to pursue its political goals. Since the beginning of this year, the US has for several times requested the World Bank, IMF and G20 to make efforts to mitigate the so-called global imbalance, abandoned its commitment to support trade openness, cut down investment projects to the middle-income countries, and deleted commitment to support the efforts to deal with climate change financially, which has made the international systems accessories of the US domestic economic agendas, dealing a heavy blow to the global governance system. On the contrary, the interests and agendas of China, as a major power of the world, are open to the whole world, and China in the future “will provide the world with broader market, more sufficient capital, more abundant goods and more precious opportunities for cooperation”, while having the ability to make the world listen to its voice more attentively. With regard to the subject of global governance, China has advocated that what global governance system is better cannot be decided upon by any single country, as the destiny of the world should be in the hands of the people of all countries. In principle, all the parties should stick to the principle of mutual consultation, joint construction and co-sharing, resolve disputes through dialog and differences through consultation. Regarding the critical areas, opening to the outer world does not mean building one’s own backyard, but building the spring garden for co-sharing; the “Belt and Road” initiative is not China’s solo, but a chorus participated in by all countries concerned. China has also proposed international public security views on nuclear security, maritime cooperation and cyber space order, calling for efforts to make the global village into a “grand stage for seeking common development” rather than a “wrestling arena”; we cannot “set up a stage here, while pulling away a prop there”, but “complement each other to put on a grand show”. From the orientation of reforms, efforts should be made to better safeguard and expand the legitimate interests of the developing countries and increase the influence of the emerging economies on global governance. Over the past 5 years, China has attached importance to full court diplomacy, gradually coming to the center stage of international politics and proactively establishing principles for global governance. By hosting such important events as IAELM, CICA Summit, G20 Summit, the Belt and Road International Cooperation Forum and BRICS Summit, China has used theseplatforms to elaborate the Asia-Pacific Dream for the first time to the world, expressing China’s views on Asian security and global economic governance, discussing with the countries concerned with the Belt and Road about the synergy of their future development strategies and setting off the “BRICS plus” capacity expansion mechanism, in which China not only contributes its solution and shows its style, but also participates in the shaping of international principles through practice. On promoting the resolution of hot international issues, China abides by the norms governing international relations based on the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, and insists on justice, playing a constructive role as a responsible major power in actively promoting the political accommodation in Afghanistan, mediating the Djibouti-Eritrea dispute, promoting peace talks in the Middle East, devoting itself to the peaceful resolution of the South China Sea dispute through negotiations. In addition, China’s responsibility and quick response to international crises have gained widespread praises, as seen in such cases as assisting Africa in its fight against the Ebola epidemic, sending emergency fresh water to the capital of Maldives and buying rice from Cambodia to help relieve its financial squeeze, which has shown the simple feelings of the Chinese people to share the same breath and fate with the people of other countries. D. To Support the Increase of the Developing Countries’ Voice. The developing countries, especially the emerging powers, are not only the important participants of the globalization process, but also the important direction to which the international power system is transferring. With the accelerating shift of global economic center to emerging markets and developing economies, the will and ability of the developing countries to participate in global governance have been correspondingly strengthened. As the biggest developing country and fast growing major power, China has the same appeal and proposal for governance as other developing countries and already began policy coordination with them, as China should comply with historical tide and continue to support the increase of the developing countries’ voice in the global governance system. To this end, China has pursued the policy of “dialog but not confrontation, partnership but not alliance”, attaching importance to the construction of new type of major power relationship and global partnership network, while making a series proposals in the practice of global governance that could represent the legitimate interests of the developing countries and be conducive to safeguarding global justice, including supporting an open, inclusive, universal, balanced and win-win economic globalization; promoting the reforms on share and voting mechanism of IMF to increase the voting rights and representation of the emerging market economies; financing the infrastructure construction and industrial upgrading of other developing countries through various bilateral or regional funds; and helping other developing countries to respond to such challenges as famine, refugees, climate change and public hygiene by debt forgiveness and assistance.

#### That solves the Case – China has the vaccine production capacity to vaccinate the world.

Mallapaty 6-9 Smriti Mallapaty 6-9-2021 "China is vaccinating a staggering 20 million people a day" <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-01545-3> (She has a master of science degree in environmental technology from Imperial College London.)//Elmer

For more than a week, an average of about **20 million people** have been vaccinated against COVID-19 **every day in China**. At this rate, the nation would have fully vaccinated the entire UK population in **little more than six days**. China now accounts for more than half of the 35 million or so people around the world receiving a COVID-19 shot each day. Zoltán Kis, a chemical engineer in the Future Vaccine Manufacturing Research Hub at Imperial College London, doesn’t know of “anything **even close to those production scales**” for a vaccine. “The manufacturing efforts required in China to reach this high production throughput are tremendous,” he says. The majority of doses are of one of two vaccines, both of which have been approved for emergency use worldwide by the World Health Organization (WHO). CoronaVac — produced by Beijing-based company Sinovac — showed an efficacy of 51% against symptoms of COVID-19 in clinical trials, and much higher protection against severe disease and death. The second jab was developed in Beijing by state-owned firm Sinopharm and has demonstrated an efficacy of 79% against symptomatic disease and hospitalization. Supplying vaccines to the world China’s current vaccine production rate could potentially **make a significant dent in global demand**, says Kis; that would be “**a huge step in reducing the health-care and economic burden of the COVID-19 pandemic**”. China has already supplied 350 million doses of the two vaccines to more than 75 nations, and WHO approval should now trigger the further distribution of both vaccines to low-income countries. “China’s vaccination campaign got off to a slow start, but has rapidly picked up pace,” says Rongjun Chen, a biomaterials scientist also at the Future Vaccine Manufacturing Research Hub. As recently as mid-April, China was administering only about five million doses a day. According to an official at China’s National Health Commission, the nation aims to produce some three billion doses of COVID-19 vaccines in 2021 — and up to **five billion per year after that**. To achieve such high production rates, many things need to go according to plan across the entire production and distribution chain, from sourcing raw materials to manufacturing active ingredients, filling vials and distributing doses to vaccination centres, says Kis. “It is crucial that everything arrives at the right location at the right time.”

### 4

#### Climate Patents and Innovation high now and solving Warming but COVID waiver sets a dangerous precedent for appropriations - the mere threat is sufficient is enough to kill investment.

Brand 5-26, Melissa. “Trips Ip Waiver Could Establish Dangerous Precedent for Climate Change and Other Biotech Sectors.” IPWatchdog.com | Patents & Patent Law, 26 May 2021, www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/26/trips-ip-waiver-establish-dangerous-precedent-climate-change-biotech-sectors/id=133964/. //sid

The **biotech** industry is making remarkable **advances towards climate change solutions**, and it is precisely for this reason that it can expect to be in the crosshairs of potential IP waiver discussions. President Biden is correct to refer to climate change as an existential crisis. Yet it does not take too much effort to connect the dots between President Biden’s focus on climate change and his Administration’s recent commitment to waive global IP rights for Covid vaccines (TRIPS IP Waiver). “This is a global health crisis, and the extraordinary circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures.” If an IP waiver is purportedly necessary to solve the COVID-19 global health crisis (and of course [we dispute this notion](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/04/19/waiving-ip-rights-during-times-of-covid-a-false-good-idea/id=132399/)), can we really feel confident that this or some future Administration will not **apply** the **same logic to** the **climate crisis**? And, without the confidence in the underlying IP for such solutions, what does this mean for U.S. innovation and economic growth? United States Trade Representative (USTR) [Katherine Tai](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/05/tai-says-united-states-will-back-india-southafrica-proposal-waive-ip-rights-trips/id=133224/) was subject to questioning along this very line during a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing. And while Ambassador Tai did not affirmatively state that an IP waiver would be in the future for climate change technology, she surely did not assuage the concerns of interested parties. The United States has historically supported robust IP protection. This support is one reason the United States is the center of biotechnology innovation and leading the fight against COVID-19. However, a brief review of the domestic legislation arguably most relevant to this discussion shows just how far the international campaign against IP rights has eroded our **normative position**. The Clean Air Act, for example, contains a provision allowing for the mandatory licensing of patents covering certain devices for reducing air pollution. Importantly, however, the patent owner is accorded due process and the statute lays out a detailed process regulating the manner in which any such license can be issued, including findings of necessity and that no reasonable alternative method to accomplish the legislated goal exists. Also of critical importance is that the statute requires compensation to the patent holder. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Act contemplates mandatory licensing of patents covering inventions of primary importance in producing or utilizing atomic energy. This statute, too, requires due process, findings of importance to the statutory goals and compensation to the rights holder. A TRIPS IP waiver would operate outside of these types of frameworks. There would be no **due process**, no particularized findings, no **compensation and** no **recourse**. Indeed, the fact that the World Trade Organization (WTO) already has a process under the TRIPS agreement to address public health crises, including the compulsory licensing provisions, with necessary guardrails and compensation, makes quite clear that the waiver would operate as a free for all. Forced Tech Transfer Could Be on The Table When being questioned about the scope of a potential TRIPS IP waiver, Ambassador Tai invoked the proverb “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” While this answer suggests primarily that, in times of famine, the Administration would rather give away other people’s fishing rods than share its own plentiful supply of fish (here: actual COVID-19 vaccine stocks), it is apparent that in Ambassador Tai’s view waiving patent rights alone would not help lower- and middle-income countries produce their own vaccines. Rather, they would need to be taught how to make the vaccines and given the biotech industry’s manufacturing know-how, sensitive cell lines, and proprietary cell culture media in order to do so. In other words, Ambassador Tai acknowledged that the scope of the current TRIPS IP waiver discussions includes the concept of forced tech transfer. In the context of climate change, the idea would be that companies who develop successful methods for producing new **seed technologies and sustainable biomass, reducing greenhouse gases** in manufacturing **and** transportation, **capturing** and sequestering **carbon** in soil and products, and more, **would be required to turn over their proprietary know-how** to global competitors. While it is unclear how this concept would work in practice and under the constitutions of certain countries, the suggestion alone could be devastating **to voluntary international collaborations**. Even if one could assume that the United States could not implement forced tech transfer on its own soil, what about the governments of our international development partners? It is not hard to understand that a U.S.-based company developing climate change technologies would be unenthusiastic about partnering with a company abroad knowing that the foreign country’s government is on track – with the assent of the U.S. government – to change its laws and seize proprietary materials and know-how that had been voluntarily transferred to the local company. Necessary Investment Could Diminish Developing climate change solutions is not an easy endeavor and bad policy positions threaten the likelihood that they will materialize. These products have long lead times from research and development to market introduction, owing not only to a high rate of failure but also rigorous regulatory oversight. Significant investment is required to sustain and drive these challenging and long-enduring endeavors. For example, synthetic biology companies critical to this area of innovation [raised over $1 billion in investment in the second quarter of 2019 alone](https://www.bio.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/Climate%20Report_FINAL.pdf). If investors cannot be confident that IP will be in **place to protect important climate change technologies** after their long road from bench to market, **it is unlikely they will** continue to **invest at** the current and **required levels.**

#### Climate Patents are critical to solving Warming – only way to stimulate Renewable Energy Technology Investment.

Aberdeen 20 Arielle Aberdeen October 2020 "Patents to climate rescue: how intellectual property rights are fundamental to the development of renewable energy" <https://www.4ipcouncil.com/application/files/4516/0399/1622/Intellectual_Property_and_Renewable_Energy.pdf> (Caribbean Attorney-at-Law with extensive experience in legal research and writing.)//Elmer

**Climate change is** the **most pressing** global **challenge** and with the international commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions under the Paris Agreement,1 there **needs to be a global energy revolution** and transition.2 This is where **innovative technology can help** meet the challenge of reducing our dependency on finite natural capital resources. The development and deployment of innovative technology play a pivotal role in enabling us to replace fossil fuel use with more sustainable energy solutions. **Patents** have **facilitated** the **development of such innovative technologies** thus far **and** will **continue to be the catalyst for this transition**. Patents are among a group of intellectual property rights (‘IPRs’). 3 These are private and exclusive rights given for the protection of different types of intellectual creations. IPRs are the cornerstone of developed and knowledge-based economies, as they encourage innovation, drive the investment into new areas and allow for the successful commercialisation of intellectual creations. IPRs are the cornerstone of developed and knowledge-based economies. Empirical evidence has shown that a **strong IPRs** system **influences** both the **development and diffusion of technology**. Alternatively, **weak IPRs** protection has been shown to **reduce** **innovation**, **reduce investment** and prevent firms from entering certain markets.4 Once patent protection has been sought and granted, it gives a time-limited and exclusive rights to the creator of an invention. This allows the inventor or patentor the ability to restrict others from using, selling, or making the new invented product or process. Thereby allowing a timelimited monopoly on the exploitation of the invention in the geographical area where it is protected. During the patent application procedure, the patentor must make sufficient public disclosure of the invention. This will allow others to see, understand and improve upon it, thereby spurring continuous innovation. Therefore, the patent system through providing this economic incentive is a successful tool which has encouraged the development and the dissemination of technology. Patents like all IPRs are key instruments in the global innovation ecosystem.5 When developing innovative technology, patents play a role throughout the “technological life cycle”,6 as shown in Figure 1. This lifecycle involves the invention, research and development (‘R&D’), market development and commercial diffusion. Patents are most effective when sought at the R&D stage. Once a patent has been granted, it becomes an asset which can then be used to7: Gain Market Access: Patents can create market advantages; to develop and secure market position; to gain more freedom to operate within a sector and reduce risks of infringing on other patents; protect inventions from being copied, and removes delaying by innovative firms to release new or improved technology and encourage the expansion of their markets. Negotiation leverage: Patents can build a strong brand or company reputation which can enhance the company’s negotiation power and allow for the creation of equal partnerships. Funding: Patents can generate funding and revenue streams for companies. Having a strong patent portfolio especially in small businesses or start-ups can be used to leverage investor funding; while also be a source of revenue for companies through licensing fees, sales, tax incentives, collateral for loans and access to grants and subsidies. Strategic value: Patents can be used to build “synergistic partnerships”8 through which collaboration on R&D and other partnerships; be used to improve in-house R&D and build and/ or develop more products. As such, obtaining and managing patent as part of a patent and broader IPRs strategy are key tools for business success, especially within highly innovative and technology-driven industries.9 Renewable Energy: The Basics Renewable energy is derived from natural unlimited sources which produce little to no harmful greenhouse gases and other pollutants. 10 Innovative renewable energy technologies (‘RETs’) have created the ability to tap into these sources and convert them to energy which can then be stored, distributed, and consumed at a competitive cost. RETs have developed into a technology ecosystem which consists of alternative energy production, energy conservation and green transportation.11 For energy production, RETs have been developed to generate energy from six main sources. These are: Wind energy: Technology, via off-shore and/or on-shore wind turbines, harnesses the energy produced by the wind. Solar energy: Technology either through concentrated solar power (‘CSP’)and solar photovoltaic (‘PV’) harnesses the energy produced by the sun. Hydropower: Technology either through large-scale or small-scale hydropower plants, captures energy from flowing water. Bioenergy: Technology is used to convert organic material into energy either through burning to produce heat or power or through converting it to a liquid biofuel. Geothermal: Technology is used to capture the energy from the heat produced in the earth’s core. Ocean/Tidal energy: Technology is used to capture the energy produced from waves, tides, salinity gradient energy and ocean thermal energy conversion. Out of these six sources, the wind, solar and hydropower energy sectors are the biggest, the most developed and the most widely used. While geothermal and ocean energy sources are used in a more limited capacity. In particular, the RETs in ocean energy is still at its infancy and thus presents an opportunity for future innovation and commercialisation. Renewable energy is the fastest-growing energy source, with the electricity sector showing the fastest energy transition. 12 In 2016, renewable energy accounted for 12% of final global energy consumption and in 2018, a milestone was reached with renewables being used to generate 26% of global electricity. The source of this energy has been driven by renewable hydropower, as shown in Figure 2, with wind and solar energy trailing behind in energy production. However, the International Energy Agency (‘IRENA’) forecasts that Solar PV will lead RETs to increase capacity in the upcoming years. 13 This rise in renewable energy is due to the increased investment into the sector and the development, diffusion and deployment of innovative RETs. For the period between 2010 and 2019, there were 2.6 trillion US dollars invested in renewable energy. 14 The majority of which being focused on solar energy. 15 This investment has surpassed the investment made into the traditional fossil fuel energy 16 and has been heavily driven by the private sector. 17 The International Energy Agency recent report showed that its members increased the public budgets for energy technology R&D, with the biggest increase in the low-carbon sectors.18 The geographic sources of this investment shown in Figure 3, reveals that the European Union, the United States and Japan are part of the largest investors. This reflects the historic involvement these countries have had in the renewable energy arena and the development of RETs. However, there is now the emergence of China, India and Brazil as large investors in this field. This trend in investment has also coincided with the increase in patenting technology in renewable energy compared to fossil fuels.19 Reports from the World Intellectual Property Office (WIPO), have shown that there has been a **steady increase in patent filing rates in RETs since the mid-1990s**.20 This increase has occurred in the four major renewable sectors, 21 where RETs patents applications were growing steadily from 2005 until reaching a peak in 2013.22 Post-2013, there has been a slight decline in patent filings, which can indicate a maturing of sectors and deployment of technologies.23 Each renewable energy sector is at a different stage of maturity and thus there is a variation of patent ownership. The wind sector is the most mature and consequently has the highest intellectual property ownership and patent grants compared to that of the biofuel sector. 24 IRENA also provides a comprehensive and interactive database for RETs patents. As seen in Figure 4 below, they have collected patent data from the major patent filing jurisdiction25 which shows the breakdown of the patents per type. This information reveals that there is a dominance of patent filings focused on solar technology. This data corresponds to the focus of the investment in renewable energy into solar energy. Upon closer look at the data, the geographic source of these patents shows that RETs patents have been concentrated in a few developed OECD countries and China. This also corresponds to the source of investment shown in Figure 3 and reflects the historical concentration of RETs innovation within these countries. 26 The latest WIPO report for 2019, which looks at the data for PCT patent applications, shows that 76 % of all PCT patent application came from the United States, Germany, Japan, the Republic of Korea and China.27 China is the newest entry into the top ten list and has made one of the largest jumps to become one of the biggest RETs patent filers at the PCT. This geographic data is also mirrored by IRENA’s statistics, as shown in Figure 5 below. This data also reflects China’s emerging renewable dominance. China is heavily **investing in solar energy** **technology** and has filed numerous patents in this area and the underlying technologies.28 The successful flow of investment in this sector can only **occur in** the **presence of a strong IPRs system** and protection. Government policies and initiatives to improve the **patent system** can be used to promote the development of RETs and drive private capital and investment into this area.29 This direct **effect on RETs** through policies was **shown in** the United States with the ‘**Green Tech Pilot Program’**.30 This was a special accelerated patent application procedure developed by the United States Patent and Trademark Office for inventions falling under the green technology category. This program ran from 2009-2011 and led to a boost in RETs patent applications, with the office issuing 1062 RETs patents from the programme. Other jurisdictions, such as the European Union and China have used policy and incentives to promote the development of RETs and the advancement of their renewable energy sector. In particular, the European Union and China began the renewable energy path at different starting points but are now both dominant players in this area.

#### Warming causes Extinction

Kareiva 18, Peter, and Valerie Carranza. "Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back." Futures 102 (2018): 39-50. (Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA)//Re-cut by Elmer

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (**climate change**, global **freshwater** cycle, **and** ocean **acidification**) do **pose existential risks**. This is **because of** intrinsic **positive feedback loops**, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all **directly connected to** the provision of **food and water**, and **shortages** of food and water can **create conflict** and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. **Ample clean water** is not a luxury—it **is essential for human survival**. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes **Humans** are remarkably ingenious, and **have adapted** to crises **throughout** their **history**. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). **However**, the many **stories** **of** human ingenuity **successfully** **addressing** **existential risks** such as global famine or extreme air pollution **represent** environmental c**hallenges that are** largely **linear**, have immediate consequences, **and operate without positive feedbacks**. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, **the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops**. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that **very warming can cause more CO2 release** which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that **forest fires will become more frequent** and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This **catastrophic fire** embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that **could catch humanity off-guard and produce a** true **apocalyptic event.** Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that **runaway climate change,** and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks **portends** even greater **existential risks**. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

#### Warming entrenches Global North-South Inequality.

LA Times 19 9-15-2019 "Editorial: Wealthy Countries are Responsible for Climate Change, but it's the poor who will suffer most" <https://archive.is/aVCFf#selection-1989.1-2016.0> //Elmer

**Although the richest**, most developed countries in the world **are** overwhelmingly **to blame for** the catastrophe of global **climate change**, they are not **the ones who will suffer the most** from it. Who will? You guessed it: the **poorest countries**. The unfairness of that is self-evident, but so is the truth of it. For more than a century, the largest emitters of greenhouse gases, in total as well as per capita, have been the big developed nations, most notably the United States and the countries of Europe, which grew their economies by burning fossil fuels and spewing carbon from their factories, homes and cars. Today they still emit carbon and other greenhouse gasses disproportionately into the environment, although other big countries such as China and India have caught up. Yet even as the wealthy nations drive the world toward ecological disaster, it is clearly the poor countries that will face the gravest consequences and have the most difficulty coping. For instance, low-lying **Bangladesh**, already battered by increasingly powerful cyclones, **could lose 10% of its territory to the ocean** within a few decades, **displacing 18 million people**. **Political instability** and violence, **influenced** in part **by droughts and poor harvests**, **have** already **driven millions** of people **from their homes in** sub-Saharan **Africa and Central America.** A recent study from Stanford University found that **climate change** is **exacerbating global income inequality between wealthy nations** in cooler regions, **and poor nations** in hotter parts of the world. This is due, at least in part, to the relative inability of poorer countries to pay for the projects necessary to mitigate the effects of climate change, including more extreme weather events and the deterioration of arable land in subsistence economies. For instance, Miami Beach is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to raise streets and install pumps in preparation for the expected flooding from rising seas — but Port-au-Prince, Haiti, only 700 miles away, simply doesn’t have the resources for such projects. A report released last week found that extreme weather displaced 7 million people from their homes during the first half of 2019, especially in Asia and Africa. That set a new record, but researchers warned that the number of such events would increase as the climate continues to change.

### Case

### 1NC – AT: COVID Advantage

#### Top-Level:

#### 1] A vaccine waiver greenlights counterfeit medicine – independently turns Case by increasing vaccine hesitancy.

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

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**.

#### 2] Lack of key supplies

Tepper 21 James Tepper, 4/10 [James Tepper, (James M. Tepper is an American neuroscientist currently a Board of Governors Professor of Molecular and Behavioral Neuroscience and Distinguished Professor at Rutgers University and an Elected Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.)]. "Global Covid vaccine rollout threatened by shortage of vital components." Guardian, 4-1-2021, Accessed 8-8-2021. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/10/global-covid-vaccine-rollout-threatened-by-shortage-of-vital-components // duongie

Vaccine-makers around the world face shortages of vital components including large plastic growbags, according to the head of the firm that is manufacturing a quarter of the UK’s jab supply. Stan Erck, the chief executive of Novavax – which makes the second vaccine to be grown and bottled entirely in Britain – told the Observer that the shortage of 2,000-litre bags in which the vaccine cells were grown was a significant hurdle for global supply. His warning came as bag manufacturers revealed that some pharmaceutical firms were waiting up to 12 months for the sterile single-use disposable plastic containers, which are used to make medicines of all kinds, including the Pfizer, Moderna and Novavax Covid-19 vaccines. But Erck and his British partners said they were confident they had enough suppliers to avoid disruption to the supply of Novavax. The vaccine is waiting for approval from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) but the first of 60 million doses ordered by the government are already in production in Teesside. The Fujifilm Diosynth Biotechnologies factory began growing the first cells for the Novavax vaccine in Billingham, County Durham this month and in a few weeks they will fill the bioreactor bag, ready to be transported to GlaxoSmithKline’s plant at Barnard Castle to be put into vials for distribution. “The first hurdle is showing it works and we don’t have that hurdle any more,” Erck said. But he added there were others still to overcome. “There’s the media that the cells have to grow in,” Erck said. “You grow them in these 2,000-litre bags, which are in short supply. Then you pour it out and you have to filter it, and the filters are in short supply. The little things count.” Novavax almost ran out of bags at one of its 20 factories earlier this year, but there had been no delays for the UK operation, according to Martin Meeson, global chief executive of Fujifilm Diosynth. “We started working on our part of the supply chain in summer last year,” he said. “We had to accelerate some of the investment here, but the commitment we made last summer to start manufacturing in February has been fulfilled.” Production of coronavirus vaccines is being ramped up. Production of coronavirus vaccines is being ramped up. Photograph: Christophe Archambault/AP Both Meeson and Erck said the UK’s vaccine taskforce had been helpful in sorting out supply issues so far, but other countries and other medical supplies might be affected. ABEC makes bioreactor bags at two plants in the US and two in Fermoy and Kells in Ireland, and delivered six 4,000-litre bags to the Serum Institute in India last year for its Covid vaccines. Brady Cole, vice-president of equipment solutions at ABEC, said: “We are hearing from our customer base of lead times that are pushing out to nine, 10, even 12 months to get bioreactor bags. We typically run out at 16 weeks to get a custom bioreactor bag out to a customer.” He said ABEC was still managing to fulfil orders at roughly that rate. “The bag manufacturing capacity can’t meet demand right now,” he added. “And on the component side, the tubes and the instruments and so forth that also go into the bag assembly – those lead times are also starting to get stretched as well. But the biggest problem we see is it really is just the ability to get bags in a reasonable amount of time.” ABEC expanded its factories last year and has now started making 6,000-litre bags, which are roughly the size of a minibus. Other firms including MilliporeSigma, part of German company Merck, have also been expanding their manufacturing facilities. American firm Thermo Fisher Scientific expects it will finish doubling its capacity this year. The US government has also blocked exports of bags, filters and other components so it can supply more Pfizer vaccines for Americans. Adar Poonawalla, the chief executive of the Serum Institute of India, said the restrictions were likely to cause serious bottlenecks. Novavax is hoping to avoid delays and “vaccine nationalism” by operating on four continents, with 20 facilities in nine countries. “One year ago, we had exactly zero manufacturing capacity,” Erck said. “We’re self-sufficient. The two main things we need to do are done in the UK. And in the EU we have plants in Spain and the Czech Republic and fill-and-finish in Germany and the Netherlands.” There was no need for vaccines to cross borders to fulfil contracts, he said. The Oxford/AstraZeneca vaccine was hit by a delay to a delivery of 5 million doses from India and a problem with a batch made in Britain, and the company has been dragged into a lengthy row between the UK and the EU over vaccine exports.

#### 3] Hurts Innovation

**Value Ingenuity 20** [Value Ingenuity, (The Value Ingenuity project is telling the story of innovation, its roots, its impact, its social and moral imperatives, and the public policy prescriptions that will assure a continued upward trajectory for the generations to follow. Our objective is to advance globally a shared purpose of mutual investment in sustainable innovation.)]. "WTO IP Waiver Would Undermine Covid Innovation." 10-2-2020, Accessed 8-5-2021. https://www.valueingenuity.com/2021/05/18/wto-ip-waiver-would-undermine-covid-innovation/ // duongie

A TRIPS waiver for vaccines would do nothing to help — and could in fact hurt — the effort to produce billions of vaccine doses and get them in arms. Supply of these high-tech products is ramping up quickly, with about 10 billion doses projected to be produced by the end of 2021 — we shouldn’t distract attention away from that all-important goal. IP is not a barrier to vaccine access. It already enabled the creation of three vaccines, in record-breaking time, that have received FDA authorization. IP is also safely facilitating international partnerships (275+ to date) to share technology and information more easily with trusted partners across borders. An IP waiver could lead to untested and unregulated copycats. Some nations are looking to manufacture sophisticated vaccines without permission, exacerbating the shortage of the critical materials (raw materials, tubing, vials etc.) and increasing vaccine hesitancy due to the development of unsafe products and medicines. The proposal jeopardizes U.S. manufacturing & jobs. Allowing other countries to take and commercialize American-made technologies conflicts with President Biden’s goal to build up American infrastructure and create manufacturing jobs. In the U.S. alone, biopharmaceutical companies support 4 million jobs across all 50 states, with many more across innovation ecosystems in labs, finance, and SMEs. Waiving IP undermines America’s leadership in the life sciences. We should not be forfeiting IP to countries looking to undermine America’s global leadership in biomedical technology and innovation. IP protections enabled decades of R&D by biopharmaceutical research companies, allowing them to move quickly and effectively against COVID-19. Business welcomes the Biden Administration’s support for the global vaccine program, COVAX. This type of program can have a significant positive, practical impact on global rollout of vaccines and therapies without disrupting the incredible IP-enabled progress that has been made to date to defeat the pandemic. Its effects will be even more effective as trade barriers are removed and all countries allow vaccines to be exported internationally. GOOD TO KNOW: Today 57% of all new medicines globally come from the United States with its world-class IP ecosystem, and private companies in the life sciences community make up more than 80% of the investment in the research and development of those new drugs. The U.S. biopharmaceutical industry directly and indirectly supports over 4 million American jobs. SCIENTISTS, ACADEMICS, ADVOCATES AND POLITICAL LEADERS SKEPTICAL OF WAIVING IP RIGHTS “The goal is noble, but the demand [for an IP waiver] is more slogan than solution … patents on vaccines are not the central bottleneck, and even if turned over to other nations, would not quickly result in more shots. This is because vaccine manufacturing is exacting and time-consuming. Look at the production difficulties encountered by Emergent BioSolutions, a vaccine manufacturer in Baltimore, where 15 million doses were contaminated. That was caught before the shots were distributed, but one can imagine the horrific consequences of a failure to maintain quality control elsewhere in the world.” WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL BOARD, May 4, 2021 “The goal is noble, but the demand [for an IP waiver] is more slogan than solution … patents on vaccines are not the central bottleneck, and even if turned over to other nations, would not quickly result in more shots. This is because vaccine manufacturing is exacting and time-consuming. Look at the production difficulties encountered by Emergent BioSolutions, a vaccine manufacturer in Baltimore, where 15 million doses were contaminated. That was caught before the shots were distributed, but one can imagine the horrific consequences of a failure to maintain quality control elsewhere in the world.” WALL STREET JOURNAL EDITORIAL BOARD, May 6, 2021 “The U.S. decision to support a temporary waiver of intellectual-property protections for Covid-19 vaccines won’t end debate on the issue, much less end the pandemic. Reaching a formal agreement could take months and even then may not accelerate vaccine production; opposition from countries such as Germany could yet doom any compromise.” BLOOMBERG EDITORIAL BOARD, May 12, 2021 “The collaboration that’s happened in the midst of this pandemic I think points to the ways in which IP has actually not been a barrier, but a facilitator of critical, cutting-edge innovation […] I don’t think that waiving IP rights will suddenly enable other countries to ramp up the manufacturing of complex vaccines.” SEN. CHRIS COONS (D-DE), CSIS: April 22, 2021 “There are only so many vaccine manufacturers in the world […] people are very careful about the safety of vaccines […] The thing that is holding us back is not IP. There is no idle factory with regulatory approval that makes magically safe vaccines […] we have all the rights from the vaccine companies and the work is going at full speed” BILL GATES, Sky News: April 25, 2021 “There are enough manufacturers, it just takes time to scale up. And by the way, I have been blown away by the cooperation between the public and private sectors in the last year, in developing these vaccines.” ADAR POONAWALLA, CEO SERUM INSTITUTE OF INDIA, February 14, 2021 “These [vaccines] are complex to make so just waiving IP and patents isn’t going to help […] you can only get trade secrets and knowhow with the cooperation of the originator companies, and they don’t have the bandwidth to do this in every part of the world … the only immediate solution is for rich countries to donate or sell their surplus vaccine to COVAX or other countries.” JAYASHREE WATAL, GEORGETOWN LAW PROFESSOR & FORMER WTO IP COUNSELOR, April 22, 2021 “It is also unclear whether a waiver of IP rights will make a difference […] Furthermore, as others have pointed out, IP rights are only a piece of what is needed to produce vaccines. There is currently a global shortage of raw materials and proper manufacturing facilities.” SAPAN KUMAR, LAW FOUNDATION PROFESSOR OF LAW AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LAW CENTER, May 9, 2021 “This is technology that’s every bit as critical as munitions and encryption codes […] It’s a platform technology that can be used to make all manner of treatments going forward, including vaccines.” DAVID KAPPOS, FORMER U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE FOR PRESIDENT OBAMA, April 22, 2021 “The notion that we would then turn around and go to the World Trade Organization and basically endorse a policy of DARPA-funded technology transfer to China is just inconceivable. You’re basically aiding and abetting China’s ‘Made in China 2025’ plans for technological dominance.” CLETE WILLEMS, FORMER SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE, INVESTMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT, April 22, 2021.

#### Turns the Aff – Delta Variant proves current vaccines aren’t enough – we need new innovations.

Guarino 8-18 Ben Guarino 8-18-2021 “Vaccines show declining effectiveness against infection overall but strong protection against hospitalization amid delta variant” <https://archive.is/pvuzL#selection-747.0-750.0> (Education: University of Pennsylvania, BSE in bioengineering; New York University, MA in journalism)//Elmer

**Results** from a trio of studies, published in the CDC’s weekly report, **motivated** the **Biden** administration **to** **consider** **booster shots**. **Three studies published** Wednesday by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention **show** that **protection against the** **coronavirus from vaccines** **declined** in the midsummer months **when** the more contagious **delta variant rose** to dominance in the United States. At the same time, protection against hospitalization was strong for weeks after vaccination, indicating the shots will generate immune fighters that stave off the worst effects of the virus and its current variations. Data from these studies persuaded the Biden administration to develop a plan for additional doses to bolster the immune systems of people vaccinated months earlier. The trio of reports, published Wednesday in the Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, the CDC’s scientific digest, also **reinforce** the **idea** that **vaccines** **alone will be unable to lift the nation out of the pandemic**. Masks and other precautions should be part of “a layered approach centered on vaccination,” wrote researchers from the New York State Department of Health and the University at Albany School of Public Health in their study of vaccine effectiveness across New York state. All three reports measure vaccine effectiveness, which compares the rates of infection or hospitalization among vaccinated people with the rates among people who had not been vaccinated. Until now, evaluations of vaccine effectiveness amid delta largely relied on observations from outside the United States. A recent New England Journal of Medicine study concluded the Pfizer vaccine was 88 percent effective against infections that caused symptoms in England. Others, such as **a study in Israel**, **found** **larger declines in protection against infection**. One U.S. report that has not yet gone through peer review, collecting data from Mayo Clinic Health System facilities in five states, **found** a **drop in** the **Pfizer**-BioNTech **vaccine’s** **effectiveness** **against delta infections to 42 percent**. The other mRNA vaccine, made by Moderna, was 76 percent effective. The new study from New York is the first to assess vaccine protection against coronavirus infection across the entirety of a U.S. state amid delta. The study authors found a modest drop in effectiveness: It descended from 92 percent in May to 80 percent in late July. Twenty percent of new infections and 15 percent of hospitalizations from covid-19, the disease caused by the coronavirus, were among vaccinated people. The second of the three studies published Wednesday by the CDC found effectiveness against infection declined for nursing home residents after delta emerged. It dropped from 75 percent in March through May to 53 percent in June and July. Vaccination for visitors and staff is crucial, the study authors wrote, and “additional doses of COVID-19 vaccine might be considered for nursing home and long-term care facility residents.” The third report, an analysis of patients at 21 hospitals in 18 states, found sustained protection against hospitalization. Effectiveness was steady at 86 percent, even in the midsummer months when delta outcompeted other variants of concern. For adults who do not have compromised immune systems, that effectiveness stood at 90 percent.

#### 4] Skill Disparities and Trade Secrets – Moderna proves IP isn’t the root cause.

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.

#### [AT Erfani] – 1] Doesn’t answer limited supplies and 2] Trade Secrets still thump – your ev only says “domestic manufacturers agree” but ZERO evidence that COVID pharma companies sign-on.

#### [AT Gurgula Strategic Patenting] – Zero example of Strategic Patenting in the context of COVID – makes this purely theoretical so prefer our empirical backing.

#### The Impact:

#### 1] Be extremely skeptical of the brink or uniqueness for this – COVID has happened for nearly two years and we have yet to see a great power conflict.

#### 2] No Correlation and best studies show COVID decreases Conflict.

Salemi 20 Colette Salemi 10-15-2020 "Does COVID-19 raise the risk of violent conflict? Not everywhere" <https://archive.is/h591O#selection-309.0-312.0> (Colette Salemi is a PhD student in applied economics at the University of Minnesota. Her research focuses on conflict, forced displacement, environmental degradation and their intersections.)//Elmer

How we did our research We **used** the Armed Conflict Location and Event Data (**ACLED**), a **database** **that counts** the **number of conflict events daily around the world**. For 2019 and 2020, ACLED includes more than 100 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe — and tracks three categories of violent conflict: battles, violence against civilians and explosions/remote violence. We examine trends in the number of conflict events over time. To see whether the trend changes in response to covid-19, we look at what happened after the World Health Organization declared a global pandemic (March 11) or the country declared a lockdown. [Don’t miss any of TMC’s smart analysis! Sign up here for our newsletter.] The **relationship between pandemics and conflict is theoretically unclear.** In some countries, job losses from the covid-19 pandemic mean people have fewer income-generating options — that can make participation in violence seem a more viable alternative. But if **market disruptions** and reduced global demand are **driving down** the **value of natural resources** such as oil wells, then **we** may **see less conflict** over control of such resources. We then **conducted** case **studies** based **on** our knowledge of countries with high rates of violent conflict before **covid**-19. These include countries with active civil wars (such as Syria) as well as countries with violent militia groups (such as the Philippines). Conflict during the coronavirus pandemic varies greatly **Worldwide**, **we didn’t observe an increase in violent conflict**. **If anything, conflict has decreased**, as the figure below shows. **Violent conflict** between March and August 2020 **was 23 percent lower** than violent conflict during the same period in 2019. Comparing these time periods, battles are down 20 percent and remote violence and bombings are down 40 percent. But violence against civilians — the deliberate attack of unarmed noncombatants by armed groups — continued at similar rates globally.
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#### 3] Cooperation and Solidarity Check.

Ide 21, Tobias. "COVID-19 and armed conflict." World development 140 (2021): 105355. (School of Geography, The University of Melbourne, 221 Bouverie St, Carlton, VIC 3053, Australia Institute of International Relations, Brunswick University of Technology)//Elmer

**COVID**-19 might also **provide** a **chance to demonstrate solidarity and good intentions**, and hence lessen grievances. The literature on health diplomacy, for example, discusses how **cooperation on** shared h**ealth challenges can increase** the **prospects for peaceful relations**. The empirical success of such efforts is so far been limited (Kelman, 2019). However, research on environmental peacebuilding has revealed that low-level, mutually beneficial cooperation can yield peace dividends in certain contexts (Ide, 2019). Furthermore, **ceasefires** **to deliver health benefits** **have** at least temporally **reduced armed conflict intensity** on several occasions **in the past** (Chattu & Knight, 2019). **In response to the pandemic** (and António Guterres’ call), **armed groups in 14 countries have announced ceasefires** to support responses to COVID-19 (Rustad, 2020).

#### 4] Actors turn inward NOT outward.

Ide 21, Tobias. "COVID-19 and armed conflict." World development 140 (2021): 105355. (School of Geography, The University of Melbourne, 221 Bouverie St, Carlton, VIC 3053, Australia Institute of International Relations, Brunswick University of Technology)//Elmer

However, **COVID**-19 might also **shape** **opportunity costs in a way** **to reduce armed conflict risks**, at least temporarily. If a **state’s capability is strained** and there is an **urgent need to deal with a health emergency**, **military offensives are** certainly **unlikely** (Price-Smith, 2009). Furthermore, existing as well as potential **rebel groups** and militias **face similar challenges** in the face of the pandemic. They need to raise money and food to supply to their fighters during an economic recession, convince their members to take part in operations rather than staying at home (to reduce infection risks and support their family or community), and deal with the logistical constraints of lockdowns and border closures. **Starting** or intensifying **attacks** **during** the **COVID**-19 crisis is **likely to decrease** the local (and international) **legitimacy** of armed groups, especially if health infrastructure is affected. The ceasefire declarations by armed conflict parties in several countries can also be interpreted as a sign that COVID-related capability and legitimacy concerns are warranted.

#### LBL 1AC Recna Warrants:

#### 1] Commander Miscalc Warrant is literally “they die” – a] other diseases like Flu also cause death and b] natural causes – chain of command solves.

#### 2] Confusion as Aggressive Cover Warrant doesn’t account for double-edged effects of pandemics.

#### 3] Zero warrant for this Proliferation Warrant – less likely in pandemics since technology and money is re-directed at social and health spending.

#### Recessions don’t uniquely cause wars

* War can occur at any stage of expansion, crisis, recession, and recovery
* Doesn’t happen at one particular stage, despite recessions being quick
* Decision to go to war based on military gains – not germane to recession
* Econ explanation for war is downward pressure – happens during prosperity because of unfounded worry for recessions

Liao 19 [Jianan Liao, Shenzhen Nanshan Foreign Language School, China. Business Cycle and War: A Literature Review and Evaluation. Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research, volume 68. Copyright 2019]

First, war can occur at any stage of expansion, crisis, recession, recovery, so it is unrealistic to assume that wars occur at any particular stage of the business cycle. On the one hand, although the domestic economic problems in the crisis/recession/depression period break out and become prominent in a short time, in fact, such challenge exists at all stages of the business cycle. When countries cannot manage to solve these problems through conventional approaches, including fiscal and monetary policies, they may resort to military expansion to achieve their goals, a theory known as Lateral Pressure. [13] Under such circumstances, even countries in the period of economic expansion are facing downward pressure on the economy and may try to solve the problem through expansion. On the other hand, although the resources required for foreign wars are huge for countries in economic depression, the decision to wage wars depends largely on the consideration of the gain and loss of wars. Even during depression, governments can raise funding for war by issuing bonds. Argentina, for example, was mired in economic stagflation before the war on the Malvinas islands (also known as the Falkland islands in the UK). In fact, many governments would dramatically increase their expenditure to stimulate the economy during the recession, and economically war is the same as these policies, so the claim that a depressed economy cannot support a war is unfounded. In addition, during the crisis period of the business cycle, which is the early stage of the economic downturn, despite the economic crisis and potential depression, the country still retains the ability to start wars based on its economic and military power. Based on the above understanding, war has the conditions and reasons for its outbreak in all stages of the business cycle.

Second, the economic origin for the outbreak of war is downward pressure on the economy rather than optimism or competition for monopoly capital, which may exist during economic recession or economic prosperity. This is due to a fact that during economic prosperity, people are also worried about a potential economic recession. Blainey pointed out that wars often occur in the economic upturn, which is caused by the optimism in people's mind [14], that is, the confidence to prevail. This interpretation linking optimism and war ignores the strength contrast between the warring parties. Not all wars are equally comprehensive, and there have always been wars of unequal strength. In such a war, one of the parties tends to have an absolute advantage, so the expectation of the outcome of the war is not directly related to the economic situation of the country. Optimism is not a major factor leading to war, but may somewhat serve as stimulation. In addition, Lenin attributed the war to competition between monopoly capital. This theory may seem plausible, but its scope of application is obviously too narrow. Lenin's theory of imperialism is only applicable to developed capitalist countries in the late stage of the development capitalism, but in reality, many wars take place among developing countries whose economies are still at their beginning stages. Therefore, the theory centered on competition among monopoly capital cannot explain most foreign wars. Moreover, even wars that occur during periods of economic expansion are likely to result from the potential expectation of economic recession, the "limits of growth" [15] faced during prosperity — a potential deficiency of market demand. So the downward pressure on the economy is the cause of war.