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### African Instability adv. (2:55)

#### Vaccines will not cover LMICs until at least 2023—fortunately there is massive room for supply increase

Nancy S. **Jecker &** Caesar A. **Atuire 21**. \*Department of Bioethics & Humanities, University of Washington School of Medicine, \*\*Department of Philosophy, University of Johannesburg, Auckland Park, Gauteng, South Africa, “What’s yours is ours: waiving intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines,” Journal of Medical Ethics, July 6, 2021, <https://jme.bmj.com/content/medethics/early/2021/07/06/medethics-2021-107555.full.pdf>., RJP, **DebateDrills.**

Since consequentialist justifications treat the value of IP as purely instrumental, they are also vulnerable to counterarguments showing that a sought-after goal is not the sole or most important end. During the COVID-19 pandemic, we submit that the vaccinating the world is an overriding goal. With existing IP protections intact, the world has **fallen well short** of this goal. Current forecasts show that at the current pace, there will **not be enough vaccines to cover the world’s population** until 2023 or 2024.15 IP protections further frustrate the goal of universal access to vaccines by limiting who can manufacturer them. The WHO reports that 80% of global sales for COVID-19 vaccines come from five large multinational corporations.16 Increasing the number of manufacturers globally would not only **increase supply,** but reduce prices, making vaccines more affordable to L[ow and] M[iddle] I[ncome] C[ountrie]s. It would stabilise supply, minimising disruptions of the kind that occurred when India halted vaccine exports amidst a surge of COVID-19 cases.

It might be objected that waiving IP protections will not increase supply, because it takes years to **establish manufacturing capacity**. However, since the pandemic began, we have learnt it takes less time. Repurposing facilities and vetting them for safety and quality can often happen in 6 or 7months, about half the time previously thought.17 Since COVID-19 will not be the last pandemic humanity faces, expanding manufacturing capacity is also necessary preparation for **future pandemics**. Nkengasong, Director of the African Centres for Disease Control and Prevention, put the point bluntly, ‘Can a continent of 1.2billion people—projected to be 2.4billion in 30 years, where one in four people in the world will be African—continue to import 99% of its vaccine?’18

A prolonged economic contraction due to the pandemic in Africa pushes millions more into poverty and also forever ends projects key to future economic progress

Lakemann and Tafese 20-- Lakemann, Tabea, Jann Lay, and Tevin Tafese. "Africa after the covid-19 lockdowns: economic impacts and prospects." (2020): 14.

The most recent economic data suggests that economic activity declined dramatically during the lockdowns. The very sharp decline in South Africa is particularly worrying, as it is likely to affect neighboring economies as well. At the same time, some countries in West and East Africa are already showing signs of recovery that may take place more quickly than anticipated. Looking solely at African aggregate growth performance and aggregate poverty will be misleading. Short-term impacts, especially on urban poverty, have likely been severe: The evidence is clear that informal workers across the continent have suffered drastic income losses during the lockdowns, as few have been shielded by social protection or other policies. It remains to be seen how quickly they can recover from the shock, but there is some empirical silver lining here as well. As elsewhere in the world, industries have been affected heterogeneously by the pandemic and the associated restrictions. This also holds for the external sector. Trade has declined dramatically, but our analysis reveals important differences between export products. Oil exporters have been adversely affected by the oil price slump and impacts on products traded in GVCs have been diverse, ranging from strong declines in textiles and apparel to increases in some food products. Food imports have hardly been affected, as global food supply chains have, overall, proven relatively resilient thus far. Finally, FDI is likely to drop substantially in 2020. Although there is again sectoral variation, this drop will not spare investments considered key for an acceleration of Africa’s economic development and the creation of productive employment. The drop in FDI demonstrates the uncertainty that looms over the hope for quick recovery. Huge setbacks to economic progress and poverty reduction in Africa can only be avoided with a quick recovery. A prolonged economic recession would not only cause poverty to rise further, but the medium- to long-term costs of the shock could be exacerbated by political turmoil or even increased conflict.

#### These direct impacts combine with indirect effects on the job market to create a vicious cycle where productivity loss increases political instability, deteriorating economic conditions and foreign confidence further, fostering even more turmoil

Carmody 20-- Carmody, Pádraig. "Meta-trends in global value chains and development: interacting impacts with COVID-19 in Africa." Transnational Corporations Journal 27.2 (2020).

The indirect impacts have, potentially, even wider effects. First amongst these is a “negative multiplier”. Dramatic reductions in the formal economy will have substantial knock-on effects on the informal sector, with potentially massive implications for poverty and unemployment. The United Nations Economic Commission for Africa forecasts that up to half of all formal sector jobs in Africa could be lost as a result of the pandemic, whereas McKinsey predicts 18 million formal and 100 million informal jobs could be at risk (Thomas, 2020). While the urban informal economy may be locked in an exploitative relationship with the formal one (Santos, 1979), it is nonetheless largely dependent on it for its survival. Reductions in remittances from urban areas or from relatives living overseas may affect rural areas particularly badly. In rural Western Kenya average income declines of 25 per cent were recorded from early April to the end of May 2020 as lockdown measures were introduced and then eased (Miguel, 2020)3 . Flows of remittances to Sub-Saharan Africa are projected to decline by 23.1 per cent in 2020 (World Bank cited in African Business, 2020). As formal sector jobs are lost, less income circulates through the economy and tax revenues are reduced. This may also have potentially severe political economy effects as “productive” social contracts (Nugent, 2019) may be further undermined, where they exist, as informalization deepens and proliferates, driving marginal productivity even further down. This may, in turn, exacerbate problems of governance and corruption in certain countries, with myriad, but generally negative economic consequences; again potentially compromising the ability to attract inward inflows of productive FDI. Reduced tax revenues may also mean reductions in infrastructural investment and social expenditure, increased indebtedness, or most likely, both – again reducing economic growth – with the potential to generate a vicious circle. While there have been some initiatives to try to limit the impact of increased indebtedness, such as a debt moratorium by the Group of 20 (G20) for low income countries until the end of the year, the head of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) has argued that many countries will need debt restructuring, rather than just a freeze (Reuters, 2020). As economic conditions deteriorate in many African countries they will find it increasingly difficult to source finance from international capital markets, which may reorient to service developed countries seeking to finance their budget deficits. Consequently, many have already been forced to ask the IMF for emergency assistance. However, the strict conditions attached to IMF loans have generally not been conducive, or have been actively detrimental, to development efforts on the continent (Mkandawire and Soludo, 1999). Dozens of countries on the continent are now under, or requesting, IMF financial assistance, even if that organization has also offered some debt relief (Mizner, 2020)4 . The (enforced) return or reinforcement of economic orthodoxy on the continent will reduce policy space for developmental states, such as Ethiopia, to emerge in the future (Carmody, Kragelund and Riboredo, 2020).

#### African instability results in global draw-in as natural resource wealth and weak governance make Africa a prime target for proxy wars

Yeisley 11, Mark O. "Bipolarity, proxy wars, and the rise of China." Strategic Studies Quarterly 5.4 (2011): 75-91. (assistant professor of international relations at the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies). (AG DebateDrills)

Of primary interest is open access to Africa’s significant deposits of oil and other energy resources. For example, China has 4,000 military personnel in Sudan to protect its interests in energy and mineral investments there; it also owns 40 percent of the Greater Nile Oil Production Company.54 Estimates indicate that within the next few decades China will obtain 40 percent of its oil and gas supplies from Africa.55 Trade and investment in Africa have also been on the rise; trade has grown more than 10 percent annually in the past decade. Between 2002 and 2004, African exports to China doubled, ranking it third behind the United States and France in trade with the continent. Chinese investment is also growing; more than 700 Chinese business operations across Africa total over $1 billion. Aid and direct economic assistance are increasing as well, and China has forgiven the debt of some 31 African nations.56 Africa is thus a vital foreign interest for the Chinese and must be for the United States; access to its mineral and petroleum wealth is crucial to the survival of each.57 Although the US and Chinese economies are tightly interconnected, the nonrenewable nature of these assets means competition will remain a zero-sum game. Nearly all African states have been independent entities for less than 50 years; consolidating robust domestic state institutions and stable governments remains problematic.58 Studies have shown that weak governments are often prime targets for civil conflicts that prove costly to control.59 Many African nations possess both strategic resources and weak regimes, making them vulnerable to internal conflict and thus valuable candidates for assistance from China or the United States to help settle their domestic grievances. With access to African resources of vital strategic interest to each side, competition could likely occur by proxy via diplomatic, economic, or military assistance to one (or both) of the parties involved. Realist claims that focusing on third-world issues is misplaced are thus fallacious; war in a future US-China bipolar system remains as costly as it was during the Cold War. Because of the fragile nature of many African regimes, domestic grievances are more prone to result in conflict; US and Chinese strategic interests will dictate an intrusive foreign policy to be both prudent and vital. US-Sino proxy conflicts over control of African resources will likely become necessary if these great powers are to sustain their national security postures, especially in terms of strategic defense.60

#### US-China conventional war goes nuclear.

[Caitlin **Talmadge** (10-15-20**18**), PhD in Political Science from MIT, BA in Government from Harvard, Professor of Security Studies at Georgetown University, “Beijing’s Nuclear Option,” Foreign Affairs, [https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2018-10-15/beijings-nuclear-option]//recut](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2018-10-15/beijings-nuclear-option%5d//recut) CHS PK

**As China’s power has grown in recent years, so, too, has the risk of war with the United States.** Under President Xi Jinping, China has increased its political and economic pressure on Taiwan and built military installations on coral reefs in the South China Sea, fueling Washington’s fears that Chinese expansionism will threaten U.S. allies and influence in the region. U.S. destroyers have transited the Taiwan Strait, to loud protests from Beijing. American policymakers have wondered aloud whether they should send an aircraft carrier through the strait as well. Chinese fighter jets have intercepted U.S. aircraft in the skies above the South China Sea. Meanwhile, U.S. President Donald Trump has brought long-simmering economic disputes to a rolling boil. A war between the two countries remains unlikely, but **the prospect of a military confrontation**—resulting, for example, from a Chinese campaign against Taiwan—no longer seems as implausible as it once did. And the odds of such a confrontation **going nuclear are higher than most policymakers and analysts think.** Members of China’s strategic community tend to dismiss such concerns. Likewise, U.S. studies of a potential war with China often exclude nuclear weapons from the analysis entirely, treating them as basically irrelevant to the course of a conflict. Asked about the issue in 2015, Dennis Blair, the former commander of U.S. forces in the Indo-Pacific, estimated the likelihood of a U.S.-Chinese nuclear crisis as “somewhere between nil and zero.” This **assurance is misguided. If deployed against China, the Pentagon’s preferred style of conventional warfare would be a potential recipe for nuclear escalation.** Since the end of the Cold War, **the United States’ signature approach to war has been** simple: **punch deep into enemy territory in order to rapidly knock out the opponent’s key military assets at minimal cost. But the Pentagon developed this formula in wars against Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and Serbia, none of which was a nuclear power. China**, by contrast, **not only has nuclear weapons; it has also intermingled them with its conventional military forces, making it difficult to attack one without attacking the other**. This means that **a major U.S. military campaign targeting China’s conventional forces would likely also threaten its nuclear arsenal**. Faced with such a threat, **Chinese leaders could decide to use their nuclear weapons while they were still able to. A**s **U.S. and Chinese** leaders navigate a relationship fraught with mutual suspicion, they must come to grips with the fact that a **conventional war could skid into a nuclear confrontation**. Although this risk is not high in absolute terms**, its consequences for the region and the world would be devastating**. As long as the United States and China continue to pursue their current grand strategies, the risk is likely to endure. This means that leaders on **both sides should dispense with the illusion that they can easily fight a limited war**. They should focus instead on managing or resolving the political, economic, and military tensions that might lead to a conflict in the first place.

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

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

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

### Disease (Long)

#### Extended COVID in developing countries will exacerbate inequalities fostered by COVID—job loss, poverty, and lack of health insurance all increase

Pley et al 21-- Pley, Caitlin M. [University of Cambridge Department of Medicine, Public Policy Researcher], et al. "The global impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection." BMJ Global Health 6.1 (2021): e004275. (AG DebateDrills)

The COVID-19 pandemic is amplifying existing economic and public health inequalities. The pandemic is likely to cause a worldwide recession and the contraction of national economies, pushing millions more below the poverty line, especially in countries without universally accessible health systems and already high levels of outof-pocket spending on health.21 Furthermore, the most vulnerable members of society are not only more likely to be affected by HBV, but they are also more likely to have comorbid non-communicable diseases that raise the risk of a severe COVID-19 disease course. Rural and indigenous communities in LMICs, as reported in India and Nigeria, are most severely affected by movement restrictions, as they impede access to health centres and the ability to earn a living wage.6 Individuals working in unstable employment arrangements risk losing their health insurance, and those working in the informal sector frequently already pay for healthcare expenditures out-of-pocket, with no access to fiscal stimulus packages and other social safety nets if they lose their employment. Such issues extend to HICs, such as the USA, where a large number of job losses have led to 6.2million people losing their health insurance since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.22 Drops in healthcare coverage will likely lead to worsening of chronic conditions, including CHB, and may reduce the incentive to seek testing services when treatment is unaffordable.

#### The plan also sets a precedent to seamlessly shift to a direct support model during pandemics--that solves future pandemics but avoids the innovation DA.

Brink **Lindsey 21**. Vice President, Niskanen Center; Writes for Brookings, “Why Intellectual Property and Pandemics Don’t Mix,” Brookings, June 3, 2021, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2021/06/03/why-intellectual-property-and-pandemics-dont-mix/>, RJP, **DebateDrills**.

**PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCIES AND DIRECT GOVERNMENT SUPPORT**

For pandemics and other public health emergencies, patents’ mix of costs and benefits is misaligned with what is needed for an effective policy response. The basic patent bargain, even when well struck, is to pay for more innovation down the road with slower diffusion of innovation today. In the context of a pandemic, that bargain is a bad one and should be rejected entirely. Here the imperative is to accelerate the diffusion of vaccines and other treatments, not slow it down. Giving drug companies the power to hold things up by blocking competitors and raising prices pushes in the completely wrong direction. What approach to encouraging innovation should we take instead? How do we incentivize drug makers to undertake the hefty R&D costs to develop new vaccines without giving them exclusive rights over their production and sale? The most effective approach during a public health crisis is direct government support: public funding of R&D, advance purchase commitments by the government to buy large numbers of doses at set prices, and other, related payouts. And when we pay drug makers, we should not hesitate to pay generously, even extravagantly: we want to offer drug companies big profits so that they prioritize this work above everything else, and so that they are ready and eager to come to the rescue again the next time there’s a crisis.It was direct support via Operation Warp Speed that made possible the astonishingly rapid development of COVID-19 vaccines and then facilitated a relatively rapid rollout of vaccine distribution (relative, that is, to most of the rest of the world). And it’s worth noting that a major reason for the faster rollout here and in the United Kingdom compared to the European Union was the latter’s [misguided penny-pinching](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/17/opinion/europe-vaccines-commission.html?smid=tw-share). The EU bargained hard with firms to keep vaccine prices low, and as a result their citizens ended up in the back of the queue as various supply line kinks were being ironed out. This is particularly ironic since the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine was developed in Germany. As this fact underscores, the chief advantage of direct support isn’t to “get tough” with drug firms and keep a lid on their profits. Instead, it is to accelerate the end of the public health emergency by making sure drug makers profit handsomely from doing the right thing.Patent law and direct support should be seen not as either-or alternatives but as complements that apply different incentives to different circumstances and time horizons. Patent law provides a decentralized system for encouraging innovation. The government doesn’t presume to tell the industry which new drugs are needed; it simply incentivizes the development of whatever new drugs that pharmaceutical firms can come up with by offering them a temporary monopoly. It is important to note that patent law’s incentives offer no commercial guarantees. Yes, you can block other competitors for a number of years, but that still doesn’t ensure enough consumer demand for the new product to make it profitable. DIRECT SUPPORT MAKES PATENTS REDUNDANT The situation is different in a pandemic. Here the government knows exactly what it wants to incentivize: the creation of vaccines to prevent the spread of a specific virus and other drugs to treat that virus. Under these circumstances, the decentralized approach isn’t good enough. There is no time to sit back and let drug makers take the initiative on their own timeline. Instead, the government needs to be more involved to incentivize specific innovations now. As recompense for letting it call the shots (pardon the pun), the government sweetens the deal for drug companies by insulating them from commercial risk. If pharmaceutical firms develop effective vaccines and therapies, the government will buy large, predetermined quantities at prices set high enough to guarantee a healthy return. For the pharmaceutical industry, it is useful to conceive of patent law as the default regime for innovation promotion. It improves pharmaceutical companies’ incentives to develop new drugs while leaving them free to decide which new drugs to pursue – and also leaving them to bear all commercial risk. In a pandemic or other emergency, however, it is appropriate to shift to the direct support regime, in which the government focuses efforts on one disease. In this regime, it is important to note, the government provides qualitatively superior incentives to those offered under patent law. Not only does it offer public funding to cover the up-front costs of drug development, but it also provides advance purchase commitments that guarantee a healthy return. It should therefore be clear that the pharmaceutical industry has no legitimate basis for objecting to a TRIPS waiver. Since, because of the public health crisis, drug makers now qualify for the superior benefits of direct government support, they no longer need the default benefits of patent support. Arguments that a TRIPS waiver would deprive drug makers of the incentives they need to keep developing new drugs, when they are presently receiving the most favorable incentives available, can be dismissed as the worst sort of special pleading. That said, it is a serious mistake to try to cast the current crisis as a morality play in which drug makers wear the black hats and the choice at hand is between private profits and public health. We would have no chance of beating this virus without the formidable organizational capabilities of the pharmaceutical industry, and providing the appropriate incentives is essential to ensure that the industry plays its necessary and vital role. It is misguided to lament that private companies are profiting in the current crisis: those profits are a drop in the bucket compared to the staggering cost of this pandemic in lives and economic damage. What matters isn’t the existence or size of the profits, but how they are earned. We have good reason to want drug makers to profit from vaccinating the world: the comparative price is minuscule, and the incentive effects are a vital safeguard of public health in the event of future crises. What we want to avoid at all costs is putting drug makers in the position where drug companies can profit from standing in the way of rapid global vaccination. That is why intellectual property rights need to be taken out of the equation. Vaccinating the world in any kind of reasonable time frame will require large-scale technology transfer to drug firms in other countries and rapid expansion of their production capacity. And looking beyond the current pandemic to the longer term, we need [ample, redundant global vaccine production capacity](https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/22397914/vaccine-mrna-adenovirus-manufacturing-process-investment) that is widely distributed around the planet. To achieve these goals as rapidly as possible will require the active cooperation of the U.S. pharmaceutical industry, which is why the direct support model now needs to be extended. What is needed now is an Operation Warp Speed for the world, in which we make it worth current vaccine producers’ while to share their know-how broadly and ramp up global capacity. Here again, we must recognize that the choice isn’t between people on the one hand and profits on the other. Rather, the key to good pandemic response policy is ensuring that incentives are structured so that drug company profit-seeking and global public health are well aligned. That means opting out of the default, decentralized patent bargain in favor of generous but well-focused direct government support.

#### Pandemics will always temporarily disrupt developing country healthcare—preventing prolonged pandemics is key to overall health

Pley et al 21-- Pley, Caitlin M. [University of Cambridge Department of Medicine, Public Policy Researcher], et al. "The global impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection." BMJ Global Health 6.1 (2021): e004275. (AG DebateDrills)

There is previous evidence to show that routine immunisation programmes are highly vulnerable to disruption resulting from epidemics, political upheaval or economic crises. When vaccination coverage rates sharply dipped in West Africa during the 2013–2016 Ebola outbreak, the incidence of measles rapidly rebounded.7 Although HBV global vaccination coverage has steadily increased since the 1990s, previous experience shows correlation of declines in vaccination coverage with political and economic unrest that disrupt infrastructure (figure 1). Since the progression to overt liver disease occurs slowly, the impact of a drop in HBV vaccination coverage may go unnoticed for decades in settings without adequate diagnostic infrastructure. Preliminary data from the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation indicate that overall global vaccination coverage levels in 2020 have dropped to levels last seen in the 1990s, threatening 25 years of progress in just 6 months.8 The USA’s federally financed ‘Vaccines for Children’ Programme has documented notable declines in vaccine ordering and administration after declaration of the national emergency on 13 March 2020, although more markedly in children older than 24 months than younger children, reflecting some success in maintaining routine vaccination of infants.9 In England, electronic health records have shown that coverage of the measles, mumps, rubella vaccination dropped by 19.8% when physical distancing measures were implemented between February and April 2020, compared with the same period in 2019.10 Reduced vaccination coverage may have particularly strong repercussions on HBV incidence in infancy and early childhood, contributing to an increase in the global burden of chronic infection and providing a long-term source of onward transmission that threatens progress towards the 2030 elimination goals. The repercussions of the COVID-19 pandemic on HBV vaccination and control may even outweigh the number of direct COVID-19 deaths in the long term. A recent model has projected that for one excess COVID-19 death attributable to visiting a vaccination delivery point, mostly in the older household contacts of children, the deaths of 84 children under 5years could be prevented if routine childhood immunisation programmes were sustained in sub-Saharan Africa.11

#### Future Pandemics cause Extinction

**Bar-Yam 16** [Yaneer. Professor and President, New England Complex System Institute; PhD in Physics, MIT. “Transition to extinction: Pandemics in a connected world.” July 3. <http://necsi.edu/research/social/pandemics/transition>] TR

Watch as one of the more aggressive—brighter red — strains rapidly expands. After a time it goes extinct leaving a black region. Why does it go extinct? The answer is that it spreads so rapidly that it kills the hosts around it. Without new hosts to infect it then dies out itself. That the rapidly spreading pathogens die out has important implications for evolutionary research which we have talked about elsewhere [1–7].¶ In the research I want to discuss here, what we were interested in is the effect of adding long range transportation [8]. This includes natural means of dispersal as well as **unintentional dispersal by humans**, like adding airplane routes, which is being done by real world airlines (Figure 2).¶ When we introduce long range transportation into the model, the success of more aggressive **strains** changes. They can **use** the **long range transportation to** find new hosts and **escape local extinction**. Figure 3 shows that the more transportation routes introduced into the model, the **more higher aggressive pathogens are able to survive and spread**.¶ As we add more long range transportation, there is a critical point at which pathogens become so aggressive **that the entire host population dies**. The pathogens die at the same time, but that is not exactly a consolation to the hosts. We call this the phase transition to extinction (Figure 4). With increasing levels of global transportation, **human civilization may be approaching such a** critical **threshold**.¶ In the paper we wrote in 2006 about the dangers of global transportation for pathogen evolution and pandemics [8], we mentioned the risk from Ebola. Ebola is a horrendous disease that was present only in isolated villages in Africa. It was far away from the rest of the world only because of that isolation. Since Africa was developing, it was only a matter of time before it reached population centers and airports. While the model is about evolution, it is really about which pathogens will be found in a system that is highly connected, and Ebola can spread in a highly connected world.¶ The traditional approach to public health uses historical evidence analyzed statistically to assess the potential impacts of a disease. As a result, many were surprised by the spread of Ebola through West Africa in 2014. As the connectivity of the world increases, past experience is not a good guide to future events.¶ A key point about the **phase transition to extinction is** its **suddenness**. Even **a system that seems stable, can be destabilized by a few** more long-range **connections**, and connectivity is continuing to increase.¶ So how close are we to the tipping point? We don’t know but it would be good to find out before it happens.¶ While Ebola ravaged three countries in West Africa, it only resulted in a handful of cases outside that region. One possible reason is that many of the airlines that fly to west Africa stopped or reduced flights during the epidemic [9]. In the absence of a clear connection, public health authorities who downplayed the dangers of the epidemic spreading to the West might seem to be vindicated.¶ As with the choice of airlines to stop flying to west Africa, our analysis didn’t take into consideration how people respond to epidemics. It does tell us what the outcome will be unless we respond fast enough and well enough to stop the spread of future diseases, which may not be the same as the ones we saw in the past. As the world becomes more connected, the dangers increase.¶ Are people in western countries safe because of higher quality health systems? Countries like **the U.S.** have highly skewed networks of **social interactions with** some very highly connected individuals that can be **“superspreaders.”** The chances of such an individual becoming infected may be low but **events like a mass outbreak pose a much greater risk** if they do happen. If a sick food service worker in an airport infects 100 passengers, or a contagion event happens in mass transportation, **an outbreak could** very well **prove unstoppable**.

## Solvency (0:45)

#### Plan: Member nations of the WTO ought to grant a TRIPS waiver for COVID medicines

#### India and South Africa have signaled ability to increase vaccine production after a TRIPS waiver—this is also our solvency advocate

Nancy S. **Jecker &** Caesar A. **Atuire 21**. \*Department of Bioethics & Humanities, University of Washington School of Medicine, \*\*Department of Philosophy, University of Johannesburg, Auckland Park, Gauteng, South Africa, “What’s yours is ours: waiving intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines,” Journal of Medical Ethics, July 6, 2021, <https://jme.bmj.com/content/medethics/early/2021/07/06/medethics-2021-107555.full.pdf>., AG, **DebateDrills.**

This view has come under increasing fire. Two competing positions have emerged. First, India and South Africa petitioned the WTO for a temporary waiver of IP rights for medical products pertaining to preventing, containing or treating COVID19.2 The wavier would apply to all WTO members and lift restrictions in four TRIPS sections: copyright and related rights, industrial designs, patents and protection of undisclosed information. It would be annually reviewed and last for a set length, determined by the WTO Council. Proponents of the proposal argue that IP protections have ‘hindered urgent scale-up of vaccine production’ and that ‘many countries—especially LMICs countries—may face institutional and legal difficulties when using TRIPS flexibilities’.12 To break the divide, WTO Director General, Okonjo-Iweala, proposed ‘a third way’ in which ‘we… license manufacturing to countries so that we can have adequate supplies while still making sure that IP issues are taken care of.’13 This approach permits companies to retain ownership while licensing other companies to manufacture their vaccines.

#### The plan is also a prerequisite to starting the WHO technology transfer hub

WHO 4/21—WHO, 4-21-2021, “Establishment of a COVID-19 mRNA vaccine technology transfer hub to scale up global manufacturing,” <https://www.who.int/news-room/articles-detail/establishment-of-a-covid-19-mrna-vaccine-technology-transfer-hub-to-scale-up-global-manufacturing>. (AG DebateDrills)

WHO and its partners are seeking to expand the capacity of low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) to produce COVID-19 vaccines and scale up manufacturing to increase global access to these critical tools to bring the pandemic under control.

WHO will facilitate the establishment of one (or more, as appropriate) technology transfer hub(s) that will use a hub and spoke model (REF) to transfer a comprehensive technology package and provide appropriate training to interested manufacturers in LMICs. This initiative will initially prioritize the mRNA-vaccine technology2 but could expand to other technologies in the future.The intention is for these hubs to enable the establishment of production process at an industrial or semi-industrial level permitting training and provision of all necessary standard operating procedures for production and quality control. It is essential that the technology used is either free of intellectual property constraints in LMICs, or that such rights are made available to the technology hub and the future recipients of the technology through non-exclusive licenses to produce, export and distribute the COVID-19 vaccine in LMICs, including through the COVAX facility. Preference will be given to applicants who have already generated clinical data in humans, as such clinical data will contribute to accelerated approval of the vaccines in LMICs. It is anticipated that WHO will work with funders and donors to mobilize financial support to establish the hubs and, as they are being established, to support the transfer of technology to selected manufacturers in LMICs, taking into consideration the need to establish permanent vaccine production capacity in regions where this is currently mostly absent. This broader objective will ensure that all WHO regions will be able to produce vaccines as essential preparedness measures against future infectious threats.

#### There are many countries including Canada, Bangladesh, Denmark, and African nations that have capacity to produce millions of doses

Meldrum and Cheng 21-- ANDREW MELDRUM and MARIA CHENG, AP News, “Vaccine technology transfer center to open in South Africa,” 6/21/2021, <https://apnews.com/article/united-nations-south-africa-africa-technology-coronavirus-vaccine-3cbdee395502802b55db2b5c81e6becd>. (AG, DebateDrills)

Poor countries in Africa and elsewhere are facing dire shortages of COVID-19 jabs despite some countries having the ability to produce vaccines, lamented Lara Dovifat, a campaign and advocacy adviser for Doctors Without Borders. “The faster companies share the know-how, the faster we can put an end to this pandemic,” she said in a statement. Numerous factories in Canada, Bangladesh, Denmark and elsewhere have previously called for companies to immediately share their technology, saying their idle production lines could be churning out millions of doses if they weren’t hampered by intellectual property and other restrictions. More than 1 billion coronavirus vaccines have been administered globally, but fewer than 1% have been in poor countries. South Africa accounts for nearly 40% of Africa’s total recorded COVID-19 infections and is currently suffering a rapid surge, but vaccine rollout has been slow, marked by delayed deliveries among other factors. South Africa currently does not manufacture any COVID-19 vaccines from scratch, but its Aspen Pharmacare assembles the Johnson & Johnson shot by blending large batches of the ingredients sent by J&J and then putting the product in vials and packaging them, a process known as fill and finish. Earlier this month the company had to discard 2 million doses because they had ingredients produced in the U.S. in a factory under suspect conditions.

# Underview

#### Extinction comes first!

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

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

#### Carbon capture is necessary to reach emissions targets – we’ve gone past core tipping points and legitimately can’t decarbonize in time absent CCS

Moniz 9/23/19 - 13th Secretary of Energy (2013 to 2017) and is the founder and CEO of the Energy Futures Initiative

Fredd Krupp is president of the Environmental Defense Fund, Ernest Moniz, “Cutting Climate Pollution Isn’t Enough — We Also Need Carbon Removal,” Text, TheHill, September 23, 2019, <https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/462609-cutting-climate-pollution-isnt-enough-we-also-need-carbon-removal>.

It has been almost four years since the Paris climate agreement was signed. But as leaders gather in New York this week for the United Nations Climate Change Summit, the world remains far off track from meeting the Paris objective of limiting global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius -- and pursuing efforts at 1.5 degrees. To meet that target, the world must achieve a 100 percent clean economy — one that produces net zero emissions, or no more climate pollution than can be removed from the atmosphere — soon after mid-century, with the United States and other advanced economies reaching that milestone no later than 2050. It’s a daunting but doable task. The consequences of falling short are enormous. This year, the U.S. government’s fourth National Climate Assessment documented the huge economic and social impacts of unchecked warming. The Pentagon has repeatedly warned of the impacts on national security and our troops. Achieving a 100 percent clean economy will require a swift transition to renewables and other zero-carbon energy sources. But we also need to face the reality that meeting the Paris target will require taking carbon out of the atmosphere at massive scale. In part, that’s because eliminating emissions will be very challenging for some sectors, especially the transportation industry and agriculture. Removing carbon from the atmosphere would also bring concentrations down, helping to stabilize the climate at safer levels. So, the push for clean energy must be supplemented by a suite of technologies known as carbon dioxide removal (CDR). It is not a question of what we’d prefer. It’s a question of insurmountable math. The crucial role carbon removal must play is becoming more widely recognized. The 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report stressed the importance of carbon removal, and the U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine late last year estimated that ten billion tons of CO2 will need to be pulled from the atmosphere annually by 2050, and double that by 2100. For context, today’s global emissions are less than 40 billion tons per year. If the 10 billion tons of CO2 from CDR were stored underground, that would be roughly double the world’s annual oil production. The good news is that there are a surprisingly large number of promising pathways for carbon dioxide removal. Nature-based approaches include reforestation and forest management as well as agricultural practices that increase carbon stored in soils. Some of the attendant challenges include competition for land and permanence of the carbon sequestration. Technological approaches include direct air capture — machines that actually suck carbon from the air — and technologically-enhanced natural processes, such as plants genetically modified with deep roots to fix carbon in the soil; enhanced mineralization, which uses certain reactive rocks to bind with carbon from the air; and accelerated ocean uptake in phytoplankton. These technologies are immature and require considerable research, development and demonstration to ensure viability and affordability at very large scale. Despite the urgency, there is no dedicated federal effort to develop these crucial technologies; existing programs are piecemeal and largely focused on sequestering emissions from industrial and electricity generating sources. The National Academies recommended the rapid establishment of a robust, focused, scalable and accelerated federal research program spanning the Departments of Energy and Agriculture, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Science Foundation, among others. Such a program would encompass the full range of technological pathways that can remove CO2 from the environment. ‘’Clearing the Air,’’ an analysis of CDR’s value and a proposed plan to deploy it, has been completed by the Energy Futures Initiative. Over the next decade, the program scale would be about a billion dollars a year. Carbon dioxide removal is not a magic bullet. We must do everything we can to deploy innovative low- and zero-carbon methods to generate electricity, heat homes, fuel vehicles, and power industry, creating new economic opportunities in the process. Tackling the climate crisis also requires placing a declining limit and a price on carbon pollution, as well as a significant increase in energy technology innovation and deployment across the board. But CDR is also not a “Plan B.” It is a critical part of any “Plan A” for climate, a necessary complement to emission reduction. It can provide more flexibility and optionality in policy planning, which could ease the transition to a carbon-neutral economy while minimizing transition costs and providing greater assurance that science-based climate goals can be met in a timely manner. It would eventually enable a net negative global economy that could bring the atmospheric carbon concentrations down — and global temperatures with it. We have delayed meaningful action for far too long. As a result, the scale and urgency of the challenge is such that we cannot simply work on doing better in the future. We need to correct what we did in the past. Carbon removal is the enabler.

#### Try or die for rapid scale up of CCS – failure to quickly scale up requires future direct-air capture tech which fails and costs too much

Rathi ’17 – PhD in chemistry from Oxford University and a BTech in chemical engineering from the Institute of Chemical Technology, Mumbai

Akshat. “Humanity’s fight against climate change is failing. One technology can change that.” <https://qz.com/1144298/humanitys-fight-against-climate-change-is-failing-one-technology-can-change-that/>

Last resort

If people don’t change their mind about CCS and governments don’t invest to make deployment of CCS at large scale a reality, the world will soon exceed the carbon budget required to keep global temperature rise below 2°C. Some models suggest we’re already on track to cross that point, and the world will have to turn to some form of the “direct-air capture” technology currently being tested at a humble scale in Iceland. To suck up carbon dioxide from the air at the levels to stop global-temperature rise, we’d need to deploy hundreds of millions of the machine now working at the Hellisheidi plant.

That’s a scary prospect. CCS might seem expensive now, but direct-air capture in the second half of the 21st century will cost many multiples more. The reason is simple physics: CCS happens at the source of emissions, which typically contain more than 5% carbon dioxide in the exhaust gas mix. The concentration of CO2 in the air is just 0.04%—100 times more dilute. Far more energy would be required to pull carbon dioxide straight out of the air, and that means far more money. The most recent estimates suggest the cost of direct-air capture could be as high as $600 per metric ton—nearly 10 times the cost of carbon-capture technologies today.

That economic hit would hurt a lot more than deploying carbon capture at large scale today. But even that may not hurt as badly as uncontrolled climate change. The latest projections show that, as soon as 2027, the cost of rising temperatures will be $360 billion per year for the US alone. The damage to the rest of world could be four times as much.

Prevention is better than cure. And, for our dying planet, either is better than doing nothing.

# 1AR

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/plural

: relating to, consisting of, or containing more than one or more than one kind or class

#### Use Merriam Webster – it’s the most common dictionary so it’s the most predictable which controls the il to prep burdens – ppl will prep based on the most common definition of the res and I meet bc im eliminating multiple medicines

#### Anti-capitalist sentiment is at the heart of the plan. The status quo accedes to intellectual monopoly capitalism.

**Sell 20** (Susan K. Sell, School of Regulation and Global Governance, Australian National University, Acton, ACT Australia. “What COVID-19 Reveals About Twenty-First Century Capitalism: Adversity and Opportunity”. Nov 2020)

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, US-based IP owners lobbied for regulatory and legislative reform to expand IP protection. Pharmaceutical, software, publishing and entertainment producers argued that their industries provided America with competitive advantages in global markets. They sought **the incorporation of IP into the trade regime** to ensure that their IP would be remunerated in global markets and that trading partners would respect and enforce their ‘rights’. By 1994 IP owners had succeed in globalizing their preferences **through** the Agreement on Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (**TRIPs**) **in the W**orld **T**rade **O**rganization (Sell 2003). TRIPs is hard law; it is binding and enforceable. It mandates 20 years of patent protection for pharmaceutical products. Violations result in trade sanctions. The institutionalization of intellectual property protection in the global trade regime **cemented** the shift from Reagan/Thatcher neoliberalism to **intellectual monopoly capitalism**. When we talk about ‘trade’ these days, we are really discussing the role of intangibles such as IP and financial services. The main beneficiaries of contemporary trade agreements are those who control global value chains (GVCs), including international banks, Big Tech, Big Pharma, Big Food and Transnational Corporations. Lead firms in GVCs promote stricter IP requirements in trade agreements to ‘contain the risk of IP appropriation resulting from the international fragmentation of production’ (Durand and Milberg 2018: 21–22). Most of the post-TRIPs trade agreements in which IP-rich nations are involved feature IP provisions that extend well beyond the TRIPs obligations in the WTO. Today, ‘profitability is a function of a firm’s ability to extract monopoly rents from complex value chains using their control over IPRs’ (Schwartz 2017: 197). For example, Apple extracts the lion’s share of value from every iPad sold whereas the manufacturers in China receive only pennies on the dollar. Big Pharma routinely blocks pro-health initiatives aimed at promoting the use of TRIPs’ flexibilities, such as compulsory licensing and parallel importation, that would make essential medicines affordable and accessible; these would threaten their profits and reduce shareholder value (Correa 2006). **The profit imperative of financialized capitalism has meant that Big Pharma has invested far more in lifestyle diseases such as e**rectile **d**ysfunction and baldness **than in diseases of the Global South.** As Feldman argues, ‘our incentive structure is badly misaligned with societal goals’ (Feldman 2018). **Patent protection increases prices and reduces access to medicines**, diagnostics, vaccines, medical devices and PPE. Strategic behaviour aimed at blocking generic competition contributes to rising drug prices. **Pharma firms routinely engage in ‘evergreening’ to extend patent protection terms.** A firm may have a popular drug with an about-to-expire patent, and then offer a ‘new’ formulation—from a tablet to a gel cap—of the same drug and obtain another 20 years of protection. This strategic behaviour does not affect everyone equally. For example, during the HIV/AIDS pandemic of the late 1990s/early 2000s as deaths plummeted in affluent countries an estimated 12 million infected Africans were left to die, ‘waiting for enough life-saving drugs to reach the continent’ (Nkengasong et al. 2020: 198). **India and South Africa have both asked the World Trade Organization to waive TRIPs provisions** to allow them to engage in compulsory licensing and parallel importation of COVID-19 therapies (Reuters 2020). **Their past experiences with HIV/AIDs and the** swine and avian in**flu**enzas **have bred understandable suspicion about the barriers to access that IP can create.** As COVID-19 tests, therapies and vaccines are developed there is legitimate concern that ‘intellectual property rights and reluctance to share related know-how may act as barriers to the rapid scale up for timely supply at affordable prices in all countries’ (Tellez 2020).

#### Symbolically, the plan’s focus on collective action forms a foundation for communist organizing.

**Berger 21** (Miriam Berger is a staff writer with The Washington Post's foreign news desk in Washington, D.C. She was previously based in Jerusalem and Cairo and has freelance reported around the Middle East, as well as parts of Africa and Central Asia. Berger previously reported for BuzzFeed World and has written for the AP and Reuters, among many other media. She has a master's degree in Modern Middle Eastern Studies from Oxford University and is a former Fulbright research fellow in Egypt. “Global vaccine inequality runs deep. Some countries say intellectual property rights are part of the problem”. February 23, 2021.)

As **the** coronavirus pandemic rages, **W**orld **T**rade **O**rganization representatives **have** periodically gathered around a virtual table and **clashed** **over** how to more equitably increase **global access to vaccines.** On one side are the United States and other mainly wealthy Western democracies, where the **major pharma**ceutical **companies** developing key vaccines and related medical technologies are based. They **want to maintain** **the status quo**, in which the trade secrets **of** their vaccines — i.e., **i**ntellectual **p**roperty — remain in their hands **to preserve profits and the incentive for future development.** On the other side are **South Africa and India**, leading the charge on behalf of the vast number of countries without any — or a limited supply of — vaccine doses and other equipment for fighting the virus. They argue that the rest of the world cannot keep waiting for the lifesaving shots, which Western countries have monopolized by buying up existing supplies and pre-purchasing future rounds. Given the gravity of the global public health crisis, the latter camp **want**s **to** resort to an emergency **waive**r mechanism, whereby the **i**ntellectual **p**roperty **rights for** making **vaccines and related medical supplies** would be temporarily suspended, which in theory would lead to production and distribution ramping up more equitably in factories worldwide. It’s a hyper-technical issue — turning on interpretation of TRIPS, the WTO’s Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights — **and it’s heavy in symbolism for developing countries** increasingly alarmed by a race to vaccinate that is stacked against them. In the immediate term, **waiving i**ntellectual **p**roperty **rights** alone cannot fix the problem of vaccine inequities and shortages. But, drawing on lessons learned during the HIV/AIDS crisis, experts said it **could have far-reaching implications by preventing subsequent scarcities and sending a signal now about the imperative of collective action.** “**Developing countries are** already **fed up with** what they perceive as **the selfishness of the West** buying up all of the demand and [that] they’ve got to get to the back to the queue,” said David Fidler, adjunct senior fellow for cybersecurity and global health at the Council on Foreign Relations. Now, he said, “they are having these sort of ridiculous conversations at the WTO about how to deal with this debacle for humanity.

#### Perm do the CP – It’s normal means. Biden is reinvigorating the US’s relationships with the WHO, meaning the US is inevitably going to discuss with the WHO before engaging in this anyways. They didn’t read normal means ev in the NC – don’t let them wiggle out of it in the 2N

Morales 1/20 Christina Morales, 1-20-2021, "Biden restores ties with the World Health Organization that were cut by Trump.," No Publication, <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/01/20/world/biden-restores-who-ties.html> DD AG

Seeking to unify the global response to the coronavirus, President Biden on his first day in office retracted a decision by the Trump administration to withdraw from the World Health Organization.

The Biden administration announced that Dr. Anthony S. Fauci, the nation’s top infectious disease expert, would be the head of the U.S. delegation to the agency’s executive board. Dr. Fauci will begin that role with a meeting this week.

In May, President Donald Trump announced that the United States would leave the organization, which is part of the United Nations. He had spent weeks accusing it of helping the Chinese government cover up the extent of the coronavirus in China.

The decision by a president who had already put the world on notice that he did not feel bound by longstanding U.S. commitments alarmed public health experts. And on Wednesday, his successor made clear that he views the organization as an ally — not an adversary.

“The W.H.O. plays a crucial role in the world’s fight against the deadly Covid-19 pandemic as well as countless other threats to global health and health security,” Mr. Biden said in a letter to António Guterres, the secretary-general of the United Nations. “The United States will continue to be a full participant and a global leader in confronting such threats and advancing global health and health security.”

In late May, shortly before declaring it was done with the W.H.O., the Trump administration made seven demands on the organization. Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, the chief of the organization, stood fast.

Just last week, experts from the organization arrived in the Chinese city of Wuhan, where the outbreak began a little more than a year ago. They plan to investigate how the virus jumped from animals to humans.

The investigators have already been met with challenges by the Chinese government, which has been wary of outside scrutiny and had repeatedly impeded the arrival of the team.