### 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.

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

#### [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.

#### 4] 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

#### WTO Credibility is on the brink – patent waivers are the make-it-or-break it issue – failure to pass the Plan dooms the WTO BUT passage signals success that generate momentum for structural change.

Meyer 6-18 David Meyer 6-18-2021 "The WTO's survival hinges on the COVID-19 vaccine patent debate, waiver advocates warn" <https://archive.is/etPtf> (Senior Writer at Fortune Magazine; Covers mostly European Business Affairs)//Elmer

The World Trade Organization **knows all about crises**. Former U.S. President Donald Trump threw a wrench into its core function of resolving trade disputes—a blocker that President Joe Biden has not yet removed—and there is widespread dissatisfaction over the fairness of the global trade rulebook. The 164-country organization, under the fresh leadership of Nigeria's Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, has a lot to fix. However, one crisis is **more pressing than the others**: the battle over COVID-19 vaccines, and whether the protection of their patents and other intellectual property should be temporarily lifted to boost production and end the pandemic sooner rather than later. According to some of those pushing for the waiver—which was originally proposed last year by India and South Africa—**the WTO's future rests on what happens next**. "The credibility of the WTO will depend on its **ability to find a meaningful outcome** on this issue that truly ramps-up and diversifies production," says Xolelwa Mlumbi-Peter, South Africa's ambassador to the WTO. "**Final nail in the coffin**" The Geneva-based WTO isn't an organization with power, as such—it's a framework within which countries make big decisions about trade, generally by consensus. It's supposed to be the forum where disputes get settled, because all its members have signed up to the same rules. And one of its most important rulebooks is the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, or TRIPS, which sprang to life alongside the WTO in 1995. The WTO's founding agreement allows for rules to be waived in exceptional circumstances, and indeed this has happened before: its members agreed in 2003 to waive TRIPS obligations that were blocking the importation of cheap, generic drugs into developing countries that lack manufacturing capacity. (That waiver was effectively made permanent in 2017.) Consensus is the key here. Although the failure to **reach consensus on a waiver could be overcome with a 75% supermajority vote by the WTO's membership, this would be an unprecedented and seismic event**. In the case of the COVID-19 vaccine IP waiver, it would mean standing up to the European Union, and Germany in particular, as well as countries such as Canada and the U.K.—the U.S. recently flipped from opposing the idea of a waiver to supporting it, as did France. It's a dispute between countries, but the result **will be on the WTO as a whole**, say waiver advocates. "If, in the face of one of humanity's greatest challenges in a century, the WTO functionally **becomes an obstacle** as in contrast to part of the solution, I think **it could be the final nail in the coffin**" for the organization, says Lori Wallach, the founder of Public Citizen's Global Trade Watch, a U.S. campaigning group that focuses on the WTO and trade agreements. "If the TRIPS waiver is successful, and people see the WTO as being part of the solution—saving lives and livelihoods—it could create goodwill and momentum to address what are still daunting structural problems."

#### Yes Link – the Plan is perceptively seen as bolstering the WTO since its by all WTO Members.

#### WTO collapse solves extinction

Hilary 15 John Hilary 2015 “Want to know how to really tackle climate change? Pull the plug on the World Trade Organisation” <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/want-to-know-how-to-really-tackle-climate-change-pull-the-plug-on-the-world-trade-organisation-a6774391.html> (Executive Director, War on Want)//Elmer

Yet this grandiose plan soon fell victim to its own ambition. The WTO’s first summit after the launch of the Doha Round collapsed in acrimonious failure. The next was marked by pitched battles in the streets of Hong Kong as riot police fought Asian farmers desperately trying to save their livelihoods from the WTO’s free trade agenda. The WTO slipped into a coma. Government ministers must decide this week whether to turn off its life support. The answer is surely yes. It was the WTO’s poisonous cocktail of trade expansion and market deregulation that led to the economic crisis of 2008. Years of export-led growth resulted in a crisis of overproduction that could only be sustained with mountains of debt. The parallel deregulation of financial services meant that this debt soon turned out to be toxic, and the world’s banking system went into freefall. Nor is the WTO fit for purpose on ecological grounds. If last week’s climate talks in Paris taught us anything, it is that we must rethink the model of ever-expanding production and consumption in order to avoid planetary meltdown. Global capitalism may need limitless expansion in order to survive, but the planet is already at the very limits of what it can take. The choice is ours. Worst of all, it is the WTO’s ideology of unrestricted trade and corporate domination that lies behind all the bilateral trade deals that are proliferating at the moment, including the infamous Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). We need a radically different model of regulated trade and controlled investment if we are to have any chance of breaking the cycle of economic and ecological crisis. For the planet to survive, the WTO must die.

#### The WTO ensures structural poverty of the Global South – multiple warrants.

Walker 11 Aurelie Walker 11-14-2011 "The WTO has failed developing nations" <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/nov/14/wto-fails-developing-countries> (trade policy advisor at the Fairtrade Foundation. Aurelie has specialised in EU trade relations with Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. She has worked as trade negotiator for an East African government, as advisor to business and government in Southern Africa on the Economic Partnership Agreement negotiations and for European Institutions and think tanks. Aurelie now advocates on behalf on Fairtrade producers on international trade issues)//Elmer

Ten years ago, a new World Trade Organisation that put developing country needs at the centre of the international trade negotiation agenda was proposed. The Ministerial Declaration adopted at the start of the Doha Development Round of trade negotiations, on 14 November 2001, was a promising response to the anti-globalisation riots of the 1990s. But the **WTO** membership **has failed to deliver** the promised **pro-development changes**. Finding "development" in the Doha Development Round today is like looking for a needle in a haystack. **Developing countries** have been **completely sidelined** **by** the **economic** **and political interests of global powers**. Here are 10 examples of how the WTO has failed the poor: 1. **Cotton**: the Fairtrade Foundation revealed last year how the $47bn in **subsidies** **paid to rich-country producers** in the past 10 years **has created barriers for** the **15 million cotton farmers across west Africa** **trying to trade their way out of poverty**, **and** how **5 million** of the **world's poorest farming families** have been **forced out of business** and into deeper poverty because of those subsidies. 2. **Agricultural subsidies**: beyond cotton, WTO members have failed even to agree how to reduce the huge subsidies **paid to rich world farmers**, whose overproduction continues to **threaten** the **livelihoods of developing world farmers**. 3. **Trade agreements**: the WTO has also failed to clarify the deliberately ambiguous rules on concluding trade agreements that allow the poorest countries to be manipulated by the rich states. In Africa, in negotiations with the EU, countries have been forced to eliminate tariffs on up to 90% of their trade because no clear rules exist to protect them. 4. Special treatment: the rules for developing countries, called "special and differential treatment" rules, were meant to be reviewed to make them more precise, effective and operational. But the WTO has failed to work through the 88 proposals that would fill the legal vacuum. 5. Medicine: the poorest in developing countries are unable to access affordable medicine because members have failed to clarify ambiguities between the need for governments to protect public health on one hand and on the other to protect the intellectual property rights of pharmaceutical companies. 6. **Legal costs**: the WTO pledged to improve access to its **expensive** and **complex legal system**, but has failed. In 15 years of dispute settlement under the WTO, 400 cases have been initiated. No African country has acted as a complainant and only one least developed country has ever filed a claim. 7. Protectionist economic policies: one of the WTO's five core functions agreed at its inception in 1995 was to achieve more coherence in global economic policy-making. Yet the **WTO** **failed to curb** the speedy **increase in** the number of **protectionist measures** applied **by G20 countries** in response to the global economic crisis over the past two years – despite G20 leaders' repeated affirmations of their "unwavering" commitment to resist all forms of protectionist measures. 8. Natural disaster: the **WTO fails to alleviate suffering** when it has the opportunity to do so. **In** the case of **natural disaster**, the **membership** will have **taken** almost **two years to** agree and **implement** temporary **trade concessions for Pakistan,** where severe flooding displaced 20 million people in 2010 and caused $10bn of damage. Those measures, according to the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, would have boosted Pakistan's exports to the EU by at least €100m this year. 9. Decision-making: the WTO makes most of its decisions by consensus – and achieving consensus between 153 countries is nearly impossible. But this shows another failure of the WTO: to break the link between market size and political weight that would give small and poor countries a voice in the trade negotiations. 10. Fair trade: 10 years after the start of the Doha Development Round, governments have failed to make trade fair. As long as small and poor countries remain without a voice, the role of campaigning organisations, such as Traidcraft and Fairtrade Foundation, which are working together to eliminate cotton subsidies, will remain critical. The WTO has failed to live up to its promises over the past decade, which reveals a wider systemic problem in the global community. True and lasting solutions to global economic problems can only come when the model of global competitiveness between countries becomes one of genuine cooperation.

### 3

#### A. Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines, then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)*

#### B. Violation:

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair –

#### a) Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides.

#### b) Shiftiness-Having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things.

#### 2. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Having one also encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.

c/a paradigm issues and dtd to deter abuse

### 4

#### Counterplan Text – Member states of the World Trade Organization ought to consult the World Health Organization on whether or not to waive intellectual property protections for Covid-19 related 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.

### Case

#### Group the first public citizen ev and the manufacturing capacity ev- can’t make enough vaccines vital components are too scarce which means they can’t solve even if other countries got involved. Cx was embarrassing here- they say countries have capacity but they are still stopping short

Tepper 4-10 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.

#### On Harman et al- this flows neg. Vaccine Waivers are a tool of Imperial Redemption AND Vaccines themselves require racialized violence for testing

Ahmed 20 A Kavum Ahmed 6-24-2020 "Decolonizing the vaccine" <https://africasacountry.com/2020/06/decolonizing-the-vaccine> (A. Kayum Ahmed is Division Director for Access and Accountability at the Open Society Public Health Program in New York and teaches at Columbia University Law School.)//re-cut by Elmer

Reflecting on **a potential COVID**-19 **vaccine trial** during a television interview in April, **a French doctor stated**, “If I can be provocative, **shouldn’t we be doing this study in Africa**, where there are no masks, no treatments, no resuscitation?” These remarks reflect **a colonial view of Africa**, **reinforcing** the **idea that Africans** are non-humans whose black bodies **can be experimented on.** This colonial perspective is also clearly articulated in the alliance between France, The Netherlands, Germany and Italy to negotiate priority access to the COVID-19 vaccine for themselves and the rest of Europe. In the Dutch government’s announcement of the **European vaccine coalition**, they **indicate that**, “… **the alliance is** also **working to make a portion of vaccines available to low-income countries**, including in Africa.” In the collective imagination of these European nations, **Africa is portrayed as a site of redemption**—**a place where you can absolve yourself from the sins of “vaccine sovereignty,” by offering a “portion of the vaccines” to the continent.** Vaccine sovereignty reflects how European and American governments use public funding, supported by the pharmaceutical industry and research universities, to obtain priority access to potential COVID-19 vaccines. The concept symbolizes the COVID-19 vaccine (when it eventually becomes available) as an instrument of power deployed to exercise control over who will live and who must die.

#### Our Turn outweighs the Internal Link – the Plan is a calculated move that allows the West to green-light broader imperialism under a humanitarian smokescreen.

Patanè 21 Andrea Patanè 5-15-2021 "COVID-19 pandemic: patents and profits" <https://www.marxist.com/covid-19-pandemic-patents-and-profits.htm> (Northern California Functional Medicine | Modern Natural Health.)//Elmer

A “calculated risk” Far from an act of ‘international solidarity', this latest **move from the US** government **is a calculated political risk,** and will be **implemented** **in the interests of US imperialism**. A section of the more serious wing of the **bourgeoisie understands** that a proper **economic recovery** can **happen** **only if** the **pandemic is suppressed** worldwide. As we have explained elsewhere, wealthy countries risk losing billions of dollars if the pandemic is brought under control only within their own borders, because new variants (like those in India and Brazil) can always mutate elsewhere and reinfect their populations, causing further economic disruption. Therefore, even on a capitalist basis, it is expedient in the long-term for the rich countries to facilitate a global vaccination campaign. Even Pope Francis anointed the demand from his seat in Rome! Biden’s announcement is also an **act of vaccine diplomacy.** America’s main rivals, China and Russia, have been shoring up their spheres of influence by distributing their Sinopharm and Sputnik V vaccines to poor countries left out by the vaccine nationalism of the US and Europe. Chinese and Russian vaccines have been exported into countries traditionally under western spheres of influence, including Brazil and Hungary. **Pushing to waive IP protections on** **COVID**-19 vaccines **is** therefore partly an effort to push back against the encroachment of rival imperialist powers, which have so far outcompeted Washington in the global vaccination drive. Biden’s announcement is also an **attempt to restore** the **standing and authority of US imperialism** on the world stage, which has been bruised by the ‘America First’ vaccine nationalist policy started by Donald Trump, and continued by Biden. According to the FT, Katherine Tai (top US trade envoy) and Jake Sullivan (national security adviser) made the case to Biden that pushing for the waiver “was a low-risk way to secure a diplomatic victory”, after coming under fire for not “respond[ing] quickly enough to the unfolding COVID-19 crisis in India”. Here you have it, straight from the horse’s mouth. Under capitalism, **vaccines** – rather than providing a way out of the pandemic – **are tools for ‘low-risk diplomatic victories’**. As if this was some sort of football match between world leaders! In short, Biden is stepping in to prioritise the interests of US imperialism as a whole over the immediate interests of the Big Pharma capitalists. But we should say clearly: this cynical attempt to claim the moral high ground came only after the US used its massive economic clout to secure enough vaccines to inoculate its own population several times over. And in fact, the wartime Defense Production Act is still in effect, which forces US manufacturers to fulfil domestic demands for medical equipment before exports are permitted. This de facto export ban has created bottlenecks in the supply chain that have already undermined the WHO-led COVAX programme to vaccinate poor countries. Rest assured, Biden’s policy remains ‘America First’, just by somewhat more calculated means than his predecessor.

#### On Stiglitz and Wallach- The plan only hurts manufacturing moving bottlenecks to less efficient manufacturers, which slows down production turning your impacts.

Alex **Knapp, 5/7** [Alex Knapp, (senior editor at Forbes covering healthcare, science, and cutting edge technology.)]. "Patent Waivers Won’t Impact Big Pharma’s Bottom Line—But Could Slow Covid Vaccine Rollouts." Forbes, 5-7-2021, Accessed 8-5-2021. https://www.forbes.com/sites/alexknapp/2021/05/07/patent-waivers-wont-impact-big-pharmas-bottom-line-but-could-slow-covid-vaccine-rollouts/?sh=78866f727862 // duongie

On Wednesday, the Biden Administration stated that it would support a proposal to temporarily waive protection of intellectual property (IP) rights for Covid vaccines during the pandemic, in a bid to boost production and accelerate vaccine distribution throughout the world. Industry trade groups immediately criticized the move, and investors reacted simultaneously—share prices plummeted, though they’ve been slowly recovering Thursday and Friday. Wall Street analysts at Morgan Stanley, Jefferies and Brookline Capital Markets, however, said in reports this week that waiving vaccine IP was unlikely to impact the financials of major vaccine makers, noting that current bottlenecks in vaccine production are related to supply chain, technical knowledge and difficulty in scaling up production. However, they caution that for the same reason, waivers could slow down current production by disrupting the market for raw materials. “Manufacturing supplies, raw materials, vials, stoppers and other key materials are in limited supply for 2021, and certainly for the 2021 calendar year,” wrote analysts from Jeffries, meaning that waivers can’t solve immediate vaccination needs in India and South Africa, where Covid-19 cases are surging. That report also notes that the mRNA vaccines from Pfizer and Moderna have yet to be authorized for use in India, as regulators desired local clinical trial data, which is another hurdle to overcome. Morgan Stanley commented that U.S. support alone doesn’t necessarily mean that a World Trade Organization agreement on the waiver would happen, especially since Germany has expressed opposition. The firm additionally notes that “manufacturing vaccines is a much more complicated process than making chemical drugs, and a patent waiver by itself would not enable other entities to manufacture their own copies of complex vaccines.” Jefferies analysts also remarked that another barrier to increased vaccine production is “ensuring the quality of the product, which is also not trivial.” Contractors for vaccine makers Pfizer, AstraZeneca and Johnson & Johnson have all run into quality-control issues that have led to millions of vaccine doses being discarded. On a company earnings call yesterday, Moderna CEO Stéphane Bancel said he doubted that waiving IP rights would impact his company much, because it would take months or even years for other companies to scale up manufacturing. Meanwhile, the biotech company has recently committed to expanding its own manufacturing capacity and expects to be able to make up to 3 billion doses of vaccine in 2022. Morgan Stanley analysts noted that in October 2020, Moderna “stated it would not enforce its patents during the pandemic, but to our knowledge, no one else has started manufacturing a vaccine that would violate Moderna’s patents.” The team at Brookline Capital markets noted that if a company did begin manufacturing vaccines based on Moderna’s patents, the upside would be an additional licensing revenue stream for the company. On Friday, vaccine manufacturer Novavax, which has reached an agreement with the private-public global health partnership Gavi to provide 1.1 billion vaccine doses to low income countries, stated its opposition to the WTO waiving patents, arguing that it “could further constrain resources by diverting them to entities incapable of manufacturing safe and effective vaccines in the near term.” Jeffries analysts note that a waiver wouldn’t put Novavax at immediate risk, as a key component of the company’s vaccine “is in limited supply and a majority of the raw material has already been locked up” by the company. That said, Morgan Stanley struck a similar point to Novavax about the risk involved in waiving patents. The analysts point out waivers could be counterproductive and actually slow down vaccine manufacturing. “An IP waiver now may exacerbate supply issues,” they write, “if some countries start to try to secure raw materials ahead of being able to produce a vaccine and cause shortages and disruptions in the supply chain.”

### Framing

#### They don’t provide any framing mechanism in the 1ac which means that you should prefer mine. If they try to refute util, you presume neg because they don’t have a framing mechanism to weigh offense.

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being or act util. Prefer -

#### 2] Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations—takes out calc indicts since they are empirically denied.

#### Extinction first –

#### 1 – Forecloses future improvement – we can never improve society because our impact is irreversible

#### On Santos- a. we don’t defend past actions of the west, we just say they should prevent future extinction. b. obviously we aren’t advocating for genocide and collective sacrifice, make them spell out why one of our offs would cause that. C. turn we’ve made arguments as to how a waiver would cause even more suffering. D. nowhere does it say that util is bad