## Biopiracy case neg

### 1

#### Interpretation: “medicines” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend WTO member nations reducing intellectual property protections for a subset of medicines.

#### The upward entailment test and adverb test determine the genericity of a bare plural

Leslie and Lerner 16 [Sarah-Jane Leslie, Ph.D., Princeton, 2007. Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. Served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University. Adam Lerner, PhD Philosophy, Postgraduate Research Associate, Princeton 2018. From 2018, Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow in the Center for Bioethics at New York University. Member of the [Princeton Social Neuroscience Lab](http://psnlab.princeton.edu/).] “Generic Generalizations.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. April 24, 2016. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/> TG

1. Generics and Logical Form

In English, generics can be expressed using a variety of syntactic forms: bare plurals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), indefinite singulars (e.g., “a tiger is striped”), and definite singulars (“the tiger is striped”). However, none of these syntactic forms is dedicated to expressing generic claims; each can also be used to express existential and/or specific claims. Further, some generics express what appear to be generalizations over individuals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), while others appear to predicate properties directly of the kind (e.g., “dodos are extinct”). These facts and others give rise to a number of questions concerning the logical forms of generic statements.

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), some individual tiger in ([2b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex2b)), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in ([3b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex3b))—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.

The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with “some” with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology “existential reading”. The application of the term “existential interpretation” is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a kind.

There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, “tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) does not entail that animals are striped, but ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.)

#### It applies to “medicines” – 1] upward entailment test – “reduce intellectual property protections for medicines” doesn’t entail reducing protections for aids, because it doesn’t prove that we should derestrict other beneficial tech

#### **Violation – they only defend \_\_\_\_**

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits – you can pick anything from COVID vaccines to HIV/AIDS to random biotech to insulin treatments and there’s no universal disad since each one has a different function and implication for health, tech, and relations – explodes neg prep and leads to random medicine of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible. PICs don’t solve – it’s absurd to say neg potential abuse justifies the aff being flat out not T, which leads to a race towards abuse. Limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep.

#### 2] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff.

#### Voters:

#### Precision o/w – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) baiting – incentivizes good debaters to be abusive, bait theory, then collapse to the 1AR RVI, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

### 2

#### CP: The member nations of the world trade organization ought to –

#### ---create a new form of Sui Generis patent applications as per Vezina 20

#### ---Grant this form of patent to Indigenous peoples

#### ---Exclude non Indigenous groups from applying for Sui Generis patents and reduce intellectual property protections for medicines for non Indigenous groups

#### Sui generis moral rights framework emphasizing guardianship over ownership and are the only way to stop the appropriate that comes with public knowledge – answers the reforms fail ev bc it bars settlers from using knowledge which isn’t sharing – also solves K of IPR used by Indigenous groups bc it uses a new fw

Vézina 20 “Ensuring Respect for Indigenous Cultures A Moral Rights Approach” Brigitte Vézina [fellow at the Canadian think tank Centre for International Governance Innovation. She holds a bachelor’s degree in law from the Université de Montréal and a master’s in law from Georgetown University], Centre for International Governance Innovation Papers No. 243 — May 2020, <https://www.cigionline.org/static/documents/documents/vezina-paper_1.pdf> SM

Features of a Sui Generis Moral Rights-type Framework

Subject Matter and Beneficiaries

TCEs that maintain a current and significant relationship with the Indigenous peoples who hold them would be protected. As long as a community, as a whole and by virtue of its own internal cultural rules, identifies with a specific form of expression and can establish a particular relationship with it, it can claim protection over it. As Susy Frankel points out, the key rationale in favour of protecting TCEs is the guardianship relationship, from which proportionate moral rights flow.155 Guardianship is to be contrasted with ownership, which is the concept buttressing most IP law systems, with the notable exception of moral rights. To wit, the Waitangi Tribunal did not recommend that TCEs be treated as owned, lest that would amount to building a legal wall around TCEs and end up choking culture.156 At any rate, cultural boundaries are porous and fluid, and it follows that blending, intermixing, hybridization or even “contamination” of cultures can be promoted.157

Obviously, cultures are seldom unique to a people. TCEs might be shared among different Indigenous groups that all identify and hold a guardianship relationship with them. In such cases, procedures should be in place to facilitate cooperation and settlement of disputes. What is more, no people are monolithic, a reality that is rendered in one illustrative phrase: “The Sámi people are one, but multiple.”158 Some communities might have distinct TCEs that have been part of their culture for a long time, with little or no outside influence. Others might have experienced contact with other cultures and incorporated various elements over the generations that have substantially modified previous iterations. For example, in the case of Mixe huipil at stake in the Isabel Marant case, some were quick to point out that the embroideries had, in the upshot of the Spanish conquest, incorporated European elements.159 Hence, when considering a relationship between a TCE and its holder, one should not exact uniqueness or exclusiveness, but embrace the fact that a group can identify with TCEs that are dynamic and kaleidoscopic, all the while remaining authentic.

Beneficiaries of protection should be TCE holding Indigenous communities as a whole, such that moral rights would be afforded to the entire community as group rights. Recognition of beneficiaries as well as determination of the authority to exercise the rights would have to be done from within the community, by way of application of customary law160 or be captured under the legal constructs of trusts, associations, or other legal entities holding the rights.161 Indigenous communities need to have the autonomy to exercise control over and make their own decisions regarding the management of their moral rights in their TCEs.162

Scope of Protection

At first glance, it is difficult to reconcile the notion of personhood, the cornerstone of moral rights, with the pluralistic conception of a community, by definition made up of several persons with their own individual personalities. In response, some scholars have wrought the concept of “peoplehood” to encapsulate the personality of a people in its entirety and provide a justification for granting a personality right to a group.163 As mentioned, TCEs often encompass cultural elements that are integral to Indigenous peoples’ sense of identity, that bear the distinct mark of their holders and, indeed, that reflect their peoplehood. Moral rights can therefore fulfill the duty, arising out of human rights law, to protect the identity of Indigenous peoples.164

Forasmuch as TCEs are collectively and communally held, so too must the moral rights of Indigenous peoples be communal.165 In fact, even conventional moral rights are not purely individualistic, and there has been a recognition of a “socially-informed view of the author” and “the social gestation of authorship... the social womb from which authors brought forth their works.”166 This strand of moral rights theory might be more congruent to accepting a group right for a community than the classic individual theory underpinning moral rights.167

Moral rights would only regulate the relationship between the community and the outside world; use in a traditional and customary context would not be affected. Just as moral rights vest automatically in the author (without any need for registration or any other form of assertion), so too would sui generis moral rights vest in the community.

Communal moral rights would include, at a minimum, the right of attribution, including false attribution (to ensure proper recognition of the community as the source and to prevent others from falsely claiming a guardianship over a TCE) and integrity (to protect TCEs against inappropriate, derogatory, or culturally insensitive use). It could be considered to also include the rights of disclosure (to make, where desired, TCEs known to the world and to retain the power to keep TCEs out of “public” reach, for example, in the case of sacred or secret TCEs) and withdrawal (to allow TCE holders to remove from circulation the TCEs that they no longer wish to make publicly available).

In most national laws, moral rights are inalienable or non-transferable. In other words, they cannot be divested from the author — they cannot be assigned, licensed or given away. As mentioned, if an author transfers all their economic rights to a third party, the author retains their moral rights in the work.168 As such, sui generis moral rights in TCEs would be independent from any economic rights that might arise and be held and exercised separately, regardless of who might hold these economic rights (in cases, for example, where communities would commercialize their TCEs and grant licences) or who might have physical ownership of a TCE (such as a cultural institution). However, in some jurisdictions, such as Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom (but not Australia and France), moral rights can be waived, irreversibly, in whole or in part, explicitly, by contract, at the discretion of the author. In order to ensure flexible protection to TCEs, it could be envisaged that sui generis moral rights be made waivable.

When applying the right of integrity, the determination of what is offensive should not be narrowly prescribed but based on the facts at hand. Assessment should be done both subjectively, from the point of view of the community that claims violation, and objectively, by the court, within the framework of guidelines to be developed legislatively or through case law, as informed by Indigenous customary laws, practices and protocols. Reliance on particular facts may be difficult to reconcile with the need for certainty and predictability, but flexibility trumps these concerns, as no use should be considered offensive per se.

#### Their ev even agrees – 1AC McGingle

the ethnopharmacology community has not yet addressed these questions with sustained debate, nor has there been much done to envision an ethical platform upon which to establish exchange agreements that incorporate ‘non-modern’ visions of the world. **Indigenous communities therefore need sui generis laws to protect their shared cultural heritage and shared natural resources**.

#### Reforming IPR is key to affirming native sovereignty. Solves the aff because it shifts away from western conceptions of property, but the perm fails since we think IPR is good.

Younging 10 “Intergovernmental Committee On Intellectual Property And Genetic Resources Traditional Knowledge And Folklore” Seventeenth Session Geneva, December 6-10, 2010 Wipo Indigenous Panel On The Role Of The Public Domain Concept: Experiences In The Fields Of Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge And Traditional Cultural Expressions: Experiences From Canada Document prepared by Mr. Gregory Younging [Creative Rights Alliance, Kelowna, Canada, Opaskwayak Cree Nation-Canada] <https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/tk/en/wipo_grtkf_ic_17/wipo_grtkf_ic_17_inf_5_a.pdf> SM

Under the IPR system, knowledge and creative ideas that are not “protected” are in the Public

Domain (i.e. accessible by the public). Generally, Indigenous peoples have not used IPRs to protect their knowledge; and so TK is often treated as if it is in the Public Domain – without regard for Customary Laws. Another key problem for TK is that the IPR system’s concept of the Public Domain is based on the premise that the author/creator deserves recognition and compensation for his/her work because it is the product of his/her genius; but that all of society must eventually be able to benefit from that genius. Therefore, according to this aspect of IPR theory, all knowledge and creative ideas must eventually enter the Public Domain. Under IPR theory, this is the reasoning behind the time period limitations associated with copyright, patents and trademarks.

The precept that all Intellectual Property, including TK, is intended to eventually enter the Public Domain is a problem for Indigenous peoples because Customary Law dictates that certain aspects of TK are not intended for external access and use in any form. As a response to this, there have been circumstances where indigenous people have argued that some knowledge should be withdrawn from circulation and that for specific kinds of knowledge, protection should be granted in perpetuity. 29 Examples of this include, sacred ceremonial masks, songs and dances, various forms of shamanic art, sacred stories, prayers, songs, ceremonies, art objects with strong spiritual significance such as scrolls, petroglyphs, and decorated staffs, rattles, blankets, medicine bundles and clothing adornments, and various sacred symbols, designs, crests, medicines and motifs. However, the present reality is that TK is, or will be, in the Public Domain (i.e., the IPR system overrides Customary Law.)

Certain aspects of TK should not enter the public domain (as deemed under Customary Law) and should remain protected as such into perpetuity, which could be expressed as a form of “Indigenous private domain.” (Younging 2007). Indigenous peoples’ historical exclusion from the broad category of ‘public’ feeds part of the differences in objectives. Indigenous peoples also present different perceptions of knowledge, the cultural and political contexts from which knowledge emerges, and the availability, or perceived benefits of the availability, of all kinds of cultural knowledge. 30

Copyright Case Study: The Cameron Case

In 1985 the Euro-Canadian author Anne Cameron began publishing a series of children’s books though Harbour Publications based on Westcoast Indigenous traditional stories. These books include: The Raven, Raven and Snipe, Keeper of the River, How the Loon Lost Her Voice, Orca’s Song, Raven Returns the Water, Spider Woman, Lazy Boy and Raven Goes Berrypicking. Cameron had been told the traditional stories by Indigenous storytellers and/or had been present at occasions where the stories were recited. The original printing of the books granted Anne Cameron sole authorship, copyright and royalty beneficiary, and gave no credit to the Indigenous origins of the stories. As the discourse around Indigenous cultural appropriation emerged in the 1990s, Cameron’s books came under severe Indigenous criticism; not only on the grounds of cultural appropriation, but the Indigenous TK holders asserted that some of the stories and aspects of the stories were incorrect.

This led to a major confrontation with Indigenous women authors at a women writer’s conference in Montreal in 1990. At the end of the confrontation Cameron agreed not to publish any more Indigenous stories in the series: however, she did not keep her word and the books continued to be reprinted and new books in the series continued to be published (Armstrong and Maracle1992). Some minor concessions have been made in subsequent reprints of books in the series and new additions. Reprints of the books that were produced after around 1993/94 contained the disclaimer: “When I was growing up on Vancouver Island I met a woman who was a storyteller. She shared many stories with me and later gave me permission to share them with others… the woman’s name was Klopimum.” However, Cameron continued to maintain sole author credit, copyright and royalties payments. In a further concession, the 1998 new addition to the series T’aal: the One Who Takes Bad Children is co-authored by Anne Cameron and the Indigenous Elder/storyteller Sue Pielle who also shares copyright and royalties.

Patent Case Study: The Igloolik Case

An example of the failure of the Patent Act In Canada to respond to Inuit designs is the Igloolik Floe Edge Boat Case.31 A floe edge boat is a traditional Inuit boat used to retrieve seals shot at the floe edge (the edge of the ice floe), to set fishing nets in summer, to protect possessions on sled when travelling by snowmobile or wet spring ice, and to store hunting or fishing equipment. In the late 1980’s the Canadian government sponsored the Eastern Arctic Scientific Research Center to initiate a project to develop a floe edge boat that combined the traditional design with modern materials and technologies. In 1988 the Igloolik Business Association (IBA) sought to obtain a patent for the boats. The IBA thought that manufactured boats using the floe edge design would have great potential in the outdoor recreation market. To assist the IBA with its patent application the agency, the Canadian Patents and Developments Limited (CPDL) initiated a pre-project patent search that found patents were already held by a non-Inuit company for boats with similar structures. The CPDL letter to the IBA concluded that it was difficult for the CPDL to inventively distinguish the design from previous patents and, therefore, the IBA patent would not be granted. The option of challenging the pre-existing patent was considered by the IBA, however, it was decided that it would not likely be successful due to the high financial cost and risk involved in litigation.

Trademark Case: The Snumeymux Case

As most Indigenous communities are far behind in terms of establishing businesses most trademarking of TK involves a non-Indigenous corporation trademarking an Indigenous symbol, design or name. Again, many cases could have been examined in this section but only two have been chosen: one case involving the Snumeymux Band trade marking petroglyphs through the Canadian Patent Office, and one involving an international corporation’s patent licence being the subject of an intense international Indigenous lobbying effort.

The Snumeymux people have several ancient petroglyphs located off their reserve lands near False Narrows on Gabriola Island, BC. In the early 1990s non-Indigenous residents of Gabriola Island began using some of the petroglyph images in coffee shops and various other business logos. In the mid-1990s the Island’s music festival named itself after what had become the local name of the most well known petroglyph image, the dancing man. The Dancing Man Music Festival then adopted the image of the dancing man as the festival logo and used it on brochures, posters, advertisements and T-shirts.

The Snuneymux Band first made unsuccessful appeals to the festival, buisnesses and the Gabriola community to stop using the petroglyph symbols. In 1998 the Snuneymux Band hired Murry Brown as legal counsel to seek protection of the petroglyphs (Manson-2003). At a 1998 meeting with Brown, Snuneymux Elders and community members on the matter, The Dancing Man Festival and Gabriola business’ and community representatives were still defiant that they had a right to use the images from the petroglyphs (Brown-2003).

On the advice of Murry Brown, The Snuneymux Band filed for a Section 91(n) Public Authority Trademark for eight petroglyphs and was awarded the trademark in October of 1998 (Brown2003). The trademark protects the petrogylphs from “all uses” by non-Snuneymux people and, therefore the Dancing Man Festival and Gabriola Island business and community representatives were forced to stop using images derived from the petroglyphs. In the Snuneymux case the petroglyphs were trademarked for “defensive” purposes. The Snuneymux case represents an innovative use of the IPR system that negotiated within the systems limitations and found a way to make it work to protect TK.

Case Studies Summary

The case studies have shown that serious conflicts exist between the IPR and TK systems and lead to the conclusion that it constitutes a major problem which Indigenous peoples must work out with the modern states they are within and the international community. In contrast to Eurocentric thought, almost all Indigenous thought asserts that property is a sacred ecological order and manifestations of that order should not be treated as commodities.32 It is clear that there are pressing problems in the regulation of TK. It is also clear that IPR system and other Eurocentric concepts do not offer a solution to some of the problems. There have been cases of Indigenous people using the IPR system to protect their TK. However, the reality is that there are many more cases of non-Indigenous people using the IPR system to take ownership over TK using copyright, trademark, patents and the Public Domain. In many such cases this had created a ridiculous situation whereby Indigenous peoples cannot legally access their own knowledge. A study undertaken on behalf of the Intellectual Property Policy Directorate (IPPD) of Industry Canada and the Canadian Working Group on Article 8(j) concluded: “There is little in the cases found to suggest that the IP system has adapted very much to the unique aspects of Indigenous knowledge or heritage. Rather, Indigenous peoples have been required to conform to the legislation that was designed for other contexts and purposes, namely western practices and circumstances. At the same time, there is little evidence that these changes have been promoted within the system, i.e., from failed efforts to use it that have been challenged” (IPPD-2002). Such conclusions, along with other conclusions being drawn in other countries and international forums, and the case study examples discussed, appear to support the argument that new systems of protection need to be developed. Sui Generis models based on and/or incorporating Customary Laws have been proposed and developed in many countries and are being discussed in the WIPO IGC.

Gnaritas Nullius (Nobody’s Knowledge)

Just as Indigenous territories were declared as Terra Nullius in the colonization process, so too has TK been treated as Gnaritas Nullius (Nobody’s Knowledge) by the IPR system and consequently flowed into the public domain along with Western knowledge. This has occurred despite widespread Indigenous claims of ownership and breech of Customary Law. The problem is that advocates for the public domain seem to see knowledge as the same concept across cultures, and impose the liberal ideals of freedom and equality to Indigenous peoples knowledge systems. Not all knowledge has the same role and significance within diverse epistemologies, nor do diverse worldviews all necessarily incorporate a principle that knowledge can be universally accessed. Neither can all knowledge fit into a Western paradigms and legal regimes. A central dimension of Indigenous knowledge systems is that knowledge is shared according to developed rules and expectations for behavior within frameworks that have been developed and practiced over centuries and millennium. Arguments for a public domain of Indigenous knowledge again reduces the capacity for Indigenous control and decision making (Anderson 2010) and can not be reasonably made outside the problematic frameworks of the colonization of TK and Gnaritas Nullius.

### 3

#### Biotech industry strong now – new innovation and R&D coming

Cancherini et al. 4/30 [Laura, Engagement Manager @ McKinsey & Company, Joseph Lydon, Associate Partner @ McKinsey & Company, Jorge Santos Da Silva, Senior Partner at McKinsey & Company, and Alexandra Zemp, Partner at McKinsey & Company] “What’s ahead for biotech: Another wave or low tide?“, McKinsey & Company, 4-30-2021, <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/whats-ahead-for-biotech-another-wave-or-low-tide> //ajs

As the pandemic spread across the globe in early 2020, biotech leaders were initially pessimistic, reassessing their cash position and financing constraints. When McKinsey and BioCentury interviewed representatives from 106 biotech companies in May 2020,4 half of those interviewed were expecting delays in financing, and about 80 percent were tight on cash for the next two years and considering trade-offs such as deferring IPOs and acquisitions. Executives feared that valuations would decline because of lower revenue projections and concerns about clinical-trial delays, salesforce-effectiveness gaps, and other operational issues.

Belying this downbeat mood, biotech has in fact had one of its best years so far. By January 2021, venture capitalists had invested some 60 percent more than they had in January 2020, with more than $3 billion invested worldwide in January 2021 alone.5 IPO activity grew strongly: there were 19 more closures than in the same period in 2020, with an average of $150 million per raise, 17 percent more than in 2020. Other deals have also had a bumper start to 2021, with the average deal size reaching more than $500 million, up by more than 66 percent on the 2020 average (Exhibit 3).6

What about SPACs?

The analysis above does not include special-purpose acquisition companies (SPACs), which have recently become significant in IPOs in several industries. Some biotech investors we interviewed believe that SPACs represent a route to an IPO. How SPACs will evolve remains to be seen, but biotechs may be part of their story.

Fundamentals continue strong

When we asked executives and investors why the biotech sector had stayed so resilient during the worst economic crisis in decades, they cited innovation as the main reason. The number of assets transitioning to clinical phases is still rising, and further waves of innovation are on the horizon, driven by the convergence of biological and technological advances.

In the present day, many biotechs, along with the wider pharmaceutical industry, are taking steps to address the COVID-19 pandemic. Together, biotechs and pharma companies have [more than 250 vaccine candidates in their pipelines](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/on-pins-and-needles-will-covid-19-vaccines-save-the-world), along with a similar number of therapeutics. What’s more, the crisis has shone a spotlight on pharma as the public seeks to understand the roadblocks involved in delivering a vaccine at speed and the measures needed to maintain safety and efficacy standards. To that extent, the world has been living through a time of mass education in science research and development.

Biotech has also benefited from its innate financial resilience. Healthcare as a whole is less dependent on economic cycles than most other industries. Biotech is an innovator, actively identifying and addressing patients’ unmet needs. In addition, biotechs’ top-line revenues have been less affected by lockdowns than is the case in most other industries.

Another factor acting in the sector’s favor is that larger pharmaceutical companies still rely on biotechs as a source of innovation. With the [top dozen pharma companies](https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/m-and-a/our-insights/a-new-prescription-for-m-and-a-in-pharma) having more than $170 billion in excess reserves that could be available for spending on M&A, the prospects for further financing and deal making look promising.

For these and other reasons, many investors regard biotech as a safe haven. One interviewee felt it had benefited from a halo effect during the pandemic.

More innovation on the horizon

The investors and executives we interviewed agreed that biotech innovation continues to increase in quality and quantity despite the macroeconomic environment. Evidence can be seen in the accelerating pace of assets transitioning across the development lifecycle. When we tracked the number of assets transitioning to Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III clinical trials, we found that Phase I and Phase II assets have transitioned 50 percent faster since 2018 than between 2013 and 2018, whereas Phase III assets have maintained much the same pace. There could be many reasons for this, but it is worth noting that biotechs with Phase I and Phase II assets as their lead assets have accounted for more than half of biotech IPOs. Having an early IPO gives a biotech earlier access to capital and leaves it with more scope to concentrate on science.

Looking forward, the combination of advances in biological science and accelerating developments in technology and artificial intelligence has the potential to take innovation to a new level. A [recent report](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/the-bio-revolution-innovations-transforming-economies-societies-and-our-lives) from the McKinsey Global Institute analyzed the profound economic and social impact of biological innovation and found that biomolecules, biosystems, biomachines, and biocomputing could collectively produce up to 60 percent of the physical inputs to the global economy. The applications of this “Bio Revolution” range from agriculture (such as the production of nonanimal meat) to energy and materials, and from consumer goods (such as multi-omics tailored diets) to a multitude of health applications.

#### Strong IPR is key to innovation – empirics and FDI

Ezell and Cory 19 [Stephen Ezell, BS from School of Foreign Service at Georgetown, VP of global innovation policy at Information Technology and Innovation Foundation. Nigel Cory, MA in public policy from Georgetown, BA in international business from Griffith University, Associate Director of trade policy at Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, former researcher in the Southeast Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.] “The Way Forward for Intellectual Property Internationally,” Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, April 25, 2019, <https://itif.org/publications/2019/04/25/way-forward-intellectual-property-internationally> TG

* FDI – foreign direct investment

IPRs Strengthen Innovation

Intellectual property rights power innovation. For instance, analyzing the level of intellectual property protections (via the World Economic Forum’s Global Competitiveness reports) and creative outputs (via the Global Innovation Index) shows that countries with stronger IP protection have more creative outputs (in terms of intangible assets and creative goods and services in a nation’s media, printing and publishing, and entertainment industries, including online), even at varying levels of development.46

IPR reforms also introduce strong incentives for domestic innovation. Sherwood, using case studies from 18 developing countries, concluded that poor provision of intellectual property rights deters local innovation and risk-taking.47 In contrast, IPR reform has been associated with increased innovative activity, as measured by domestic patent filings, albeit with some variation across countries and sectors.48 For example, Ryan, in a study of biomedical innovations and patent reform in Brazil, found that patents provided incentives for innovation investments and facilitated the functioning of technology markets.49 Park and Lippoldt also observed that the provision of adequate protection for IPRs can help to stimulate local innovation, in some cases building on the transfer of technologies that provide inputs and spillovers.50 In other words, local innovators are introduced to technologies first through the technology transfer that takes place in an environment wherein protection of IPRs is assured; then, they may build on those ideas to create an evolved product or develop alternate approaches (i.e., to innovate). Related research finds that trade in technology—through channels including imports, foreign direct investment, and technology licensing—improves the quality of developing-country innovation by increasing the pool of ideas and efficiency of innovation by encouraging the division of innovative labor and specialization.51 However, Maskus notes that without protection from potential abuse of their newly developed technologies, foreign enterprises may be less willing to reveal technical information associated with their innovations.52 The protection of patents and trade secrets provides necessary legal assurances for firms wishing to reveal proprietary characteristics of technologies to subsidiaries and licensees via contracts.

The relationship between IPR rights and innovation can also be seen in studies of how the introduction of stronger IPR laws, with regard to patents, copyrights, and trademarks, affect R&D activity in an economy. Studies by Varsakelis and by Kanwar and Evenson found that R&D to GDP ratios are positively related to the strength of patent rights, and are conditional on other factors.53 Cavazos Cepeda et al. found a positive influence of IPRs on the level of R&D in an economy, with each 1 percent increase in the level of protection of IPRs in an economy (as measured by improvements to a country’s score in the Patent Rights Index) equating to, on average, a 0.7 percent increase in the domestic level of R&D.54 Likewise, a 1 percent increase in copyright protection was associated with a 3.3 percent increase in domestic R&D. Similarly, when trademark protection increased by 1 percent, there was an associated R&D increase of 1.4 percent. As the authors concluded, “Increases in the protection of the IPRs carried economic benefits in the form of higher inflows of FDI, and increases in the levels of both domestically conducted R&D and service imports as measured by licensing fees.”55 As Jackson summarized, regarding the relationship between IPR reform and both innovation and R&D, and FDI, “In addition to spurring domestic innovation, strong intellectual property rights can increase incentives for foreign direct investment which in turn also leads to economic growth.”56

#### The link is massive – 50+ percent of prescription meds stem from Indigenous knowledge – preempot just proves thuis

Eiland 08 [Dr. Eiland received a doctorate in Oriental Archaeology from Oxford University and an LLM from the Munich Intellectual Property Law Center], “Patenting Traditional Medicine”, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG, pg. 7-10, 2008 //SLC PK

* TM = traditional medicine

In 1982, it was estimated that about 50 % of all filled prescriptions in the US originated from drugs that were derived – one way or another – from natural substances. This generated US sales of about 20 billion.4 Another estimate found that 3/4 of the plants used in prescription drugs originally came to the attention of drug companies because of their use in TM.5 In 1995, the worldwide market value of TM derived pharmaceuticals was estimated to be $43 billon.6 While one could argue about the precise values, TM has significant pharmaceutical applications. Drug companies are interested in acquiring TM, both natural substances, as well as the knowledge about how to use them.

#### Biopharmaceutical innovation is key to prevent future pandemics and bioterror – turns case

Marjanovic and Feijao 20 [(Sonja Marjanovic, Ph.D., Judge Business School, University of Cambridge. Carolina Feijao, Ph.D. in biochemistry, University of Cambridge; M.Sc. in quantitative biology, Imperial College London; B.Sc. in biology, University of Lisbon.) "How to Best Enable Pharma Innovation Beyond the COVID-19 Crisis," RAND Corporation, 05-2020, https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PEA407-1.html] TDI

As key actors in the healthcare innovation landscape, pharmaceutical and life sciences companies have been called on to develop medicines, vaccines and diagnostics for pressing public health challenges. The COVID-19 crisis is one such challenge, but there are many others. For example, MERS, SARS, Ebola, Zika and avian and swine flu are also infectious diseases that represent public health threats. Infectious agents such as anthrax, smallpox and tularemia could present threats in a bioterrorism context.1 The general threat to public health that is posed by antimicrobial resistance is also well-recognised as an area in need of pharmaceutical innovation. Innovating in response to these challenges does not always align well with pharmaceutical industry commercial models, shareholder expectations and competition within the industry. However, the expertise, networks and infrastructure that industry has within its reach, as well as public expectations and the moral imperative, make pharmaceutical companies and the wider life sciences sector an indispensable partner in the search for solutions that save lives. This perspective argues for the need to establish more sustainable and scalable ways of incentivising pharmaceutical innovation in response to infectious disease threats to public health. It considers both past and current examples of efforts to mobilise pharmaceutical innovation in high commercial risk areas, including in the context of current efforts to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. In global pandemic crises like COVID-19, the urgency and scale of the crisis – as well as the spotlight placed on pharmaceutical companies – mean that contributing to the search for effective medicines, vaccines or diagnostics is essential for socially responsible companies in the sector. 2 It is therefore unsurprising that we are seeing industry-wide efforts unfold at unprecedented scale and pace. Whereas there is always scope for more activity, industry is currently contributing in a variety of ways. Examples include pharmaceutical companies donating existing compounds to assess their utility in the fight against COVID19; screening existing compound libraries in-house or with partners to see if they can be repurposed; accelerating trials for potentially effective medicine or vaccine candidates; and in some cases rapidly accelerating in-house research and development to discover new treatments or vaccine agents and develop diagnostics tests.3,4 Pharmaceutical companies are collaborating with each other in some of these efforts and participating in global R&D partnerships (such as the Innovative Medicines Initiative effort to accelerate the development of potential therapies for COVID-19) and supporting national efforts to expand diagnosis and testing capacity and ensure affordable and ready access to potential solutions.3,5,6 The primary purpose of such innovation is to benefit patients and wider population health. Although there are also reputational benefits from involvement that can be realised across the industry, there are likely to be relatively few companies that are ‘commercial’ winners. Those who might gain substantial revenues will be under pressure not to be seen as profiting from the pandemic. In the United Kingdom for example, GSK has stated that it does not expect to profit from its COVID-19 related activities and that any gains will be invested in supporting research and long-term pandemic preparedness, as well as in developing products that would be affordable in the world’s poorest countries.7 Similarly, in the United States AbbVie has waived intellectual property rights for an existing combination product that is being tested for therapeutic potential against COVID-19, which would support affordability and allow for a supply of generics.8,9 Johnson & Johnson has stated that its potential vaccine – which is expected to begin trials – will be available on a not-for-profit basis during the pandemic.10 Pharma is mobilising substantial efforts to rise to the COVID-19 challenge at hand. However, we need to consider how pharmaceutical innovation for responding to emerging infectious diseases can best be enabled beyond the current crisis. Many public health threats (including those associated with other infectious diseases, bioterrorism agents and antimicrobial resistance) are urgently in need of pharmaceutical innovation, even if their impacts are not as visible to society as COVID-19 is in the immediate term. The pharmaceutical industry has responded to previous public health emergencies associated with infectious disease in recent times – for example those associated with Ebola and Zika outbreaks.11 However, it has done so to a lesser scale than for COVID-19 and with contributions from fewer companies. Similarly, levels of activity in response to the threat of antimicrobial resistance are still low.12 There are important policy questions as to whether – and how – industry could engage with such public health threats to an even greater extent under improved innovation conditions.

#### COVID incentivizes engineered bioterror- extinction

Walsh, 20 -- Axios Future correspondent [Bryan Walsh, "The coronavirus pandemic reawakens bioweapon fears," Axios, 5-14-2020, https://www.axios.com/coronavirus-pandemic-pathogen-bioweapon-45417c86-52aa-41b1-8a99-44a6e597d3a8.html, accessed 9-7-2020]

The coronavirus pandemic reawakens bioweapon fears

The immense human and economic toll of the COVID-19 pandemic only underscores the threat posed by pathogens that could be deliberately engineered and released.

Why it matters: New technology like gene editing and DNA synthesis has made the creation of more virulent pathogens easier. Yet security and regulation efforts haven't kept pace with the science.

What's happening: Despite some claims by the White House, overwhelming scientific evidence indicates that the novel coronavirus was not accidentally released from a lab or deliberately engineered, but naturally spilled over from an animal source.

That doesn't mean the threat from bioweapons isn't dire. Along with AI, engineered pandemics are widely considered the biggest existential risk facing humanity.

That's in part because a pathogen could be engineered in a lab for maximum contagiousness and virulence, well beyond what would arise through natural selection.

Case in point: a 2018 pandemic simulation put on by the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security featured a fictional engineered virus called Clade X that combined the contagiousness of the common cold with the virulence of the real-life Nipah virus, which has a mortality rate of 40-75%. The resulting simulated global outbreak killed 150 million people.

COVID-19 isn't anywhere near that fatal, but the pandemic has shown the vulnerability of the U.S. and the world to biological threats both natural and manmade.

"Potential adversaries are of course seeing the same things we’re seeing," says Richard Pilch of the Middlebury Institute of International Studies. "Anyone looking for a radical leveling approach — whether a state actor like North Korea or a motivated terrorist organization — may be influenced by COVID-19 to consider pursuing a biological weapons capability."

Background: Bioweapons were officially banned by the Biological Weapons Convention in 1975, though North Korea is suspected of maintaining an offensive bioweapons program.

A particular concern about biowarfare and bioterror, though, is that many of the tools and methods that could be used to create a weaponized virus are largely indistinguishable from those used in the course of legitimate scientific research. This makes biotechnology "dual-use" — and that much more difficult to safely regulate without cutting off research that could be vitally important.

While earlier bioweapons fears focused on the possibility that a state or terror group could try to weaponize a known dangerous agent like smallpox — which would require somehow obtaining restricted pathogens — new technology means that someone could obtain the genetic sequence of a germ online and synthesize it in the lab.

"If you've been trained in a relevant technical discipline, that means you can make almost any potentially harmful agent that you're aware of," says Kevin Esvelt, a biologist at the MIT Media Lab and a member of the CDC's Biological Agent Containment Working Group. That would include the novel coronavirus that causes COVID-19, which was recently synthesized from its genetic sequence in a study published in Nature.

How it works: Currently, synthetic DNA is ordered through commercial suppliers. But while most suppliers screen DNA orders for the sequences of dangerous pathogens, they're not required to — and not all do, which means safety efforts are "incomplete, inaccurate, and insecure," says Esvelt.

Screening efforts that look for the genetic sequences of known pathogens also wouldn't necessarily be able to detect when synthetic DNA was being used to make something entirely novel and dangerous.

In the near future, desktop DNA synthesizers may be able to generate synthetic DNA in the lab, cutting out the need for commercial suppliers — and potential security screenings.

The democratization of biotechnology could unleash a wave of creativity and innovation, just as the democratization of personal computing did. But it also increases the number of people who could potentially make a dangerous engineered virus, whether deliberately or by accident.

### 4

#### CP: The member nations of the World Trade Organization should enter into a prior and binding consultation with the World Health Organization over whether to [plan]. Member nations should support the proposal and adopt the results of consultation.

#### WHO says yes – it supports increasing the availability of generics and limiting TRIPS

Hoen 03 [(Ellen T., researcher at the University Medical Centre at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands who has been listed as one of the 50 most influential people in intellectual property by the journal Managing Intellectual Property, PhD from the University of Groningen) “TRIPS, Pharmaceutical Patents and Access to Essential Medicines: Seattle, Doha and Beyond,” Chicago Journal of International Law, 2003] JL

However, subsequent resolutions of the World Health Assembly have strengthened the WHO’s mandate in the trade arena. In 2001, the World Health Assembly adopted two resolutions in particular that had a bearing on the debate over TRIPS [30]. The resolutions addressed:

– the need to strengthen policies to increase the availability of generic drugs;

– and the need to evaluate the impact of TRIPS on access to drugs, local manufacturing capacity, and the development of new drugs

#### Consultation boosts strong leadership, authority, and cohesion among member states – key to WHO legitimacy

Gostin et al 15 [(Lawrence O., Linda D. & Timothy J. O’Neill Professor of Global Health Law at Georgetown University, Faculty Director of the O’Neill Institute for National & Global Health Law, Director of the World Health Organization Collaborating Center on Public Health Law & Human Rights, JD from Duke University) “The Normative Authority of the World Health Organization,” Georgetown University Law Center, 5/2/2015] JL

Members want the WHO to exert leadership, harmonize disparate activities, and set priorities. Yet they resist intrusions into their sovereignty, and want to exert control. In other words, ‘everyone desires coordination, but no one wants to be coordinated.’ States often ardently defend their geostrategic interests. As the Indonesian virus-sharing episode illustrates, the WHO is pulled between power blocs, with North America and Europe (the primary funders) on one side and emerging economies such as Brazil, China, and India on the other. An inherent tension exists between richer ‘net contributor’ states and poorer ‘net recipient’ states, with the former seeking smaller WHO budgets and the latter larger budgets.

Overall, national politics drive self-interest, with states resisting externally imposed obligations for funding and action. Some political leaders express antipathy to, even distrust of, UN institutions, viewing them as bureaucratic and inefficient. In this political environment, it is unsurprising that members fail to act as shareholders. Ebola placed into stark relief the failure of the international community to increase capacities as required by the IHR. Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone had some of the world's weakest health systems, with little capacity to either monitor or respond to the Ebola epidemic.20 This caused enormous suffering in West Africa and placed countries throughout the region e and the world e at risk. Member states should recognize that the health of their citizens depends on strengthening others' capacity. The WHO has a central role in creating systems to facilitate and encourage such cooperation.

The WHO cannot succeed unless members act as shareholders, foregoing a measure of sovereignty for the global common good. It is in all states' interests to have a strong global health leader, safeguarding health security, building health systems, and reducing health inequalities. But that will not happen unless members fund the Organization generously, grant it authority and flexibility, and hold it accountable.

#### WHO is critical to disease prevention – it is the only international institution that can disperse information, standardize global public health, and facilitate public-private cooperation

Murtugudde 20 [(Raghu, professor of atmospheric and oceanic science at the University of Maryland, PhD in mechanical engineering from Columbia University) “Why We Need the World Health Organization Now More Than Ever,” Science, 4/19/2020] JL

WHO continues to play an indispensable role during the current COVID-19 outbreak itself. In November 2018, the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine organised a workshop to explore lessons from past influenza outbreaks and so develop recommendations for pandemic preparedness for 2030. The salient findings serve well to underscore the critical role of WHO for humankind.

The world’s influenza burden has only increased in the last two decades, a period in which there have also been 30 new zoonotic diseases. A warming world with increasing humidity, lost habitats and industrial livestock/poultry farming has many opportunities for pathogens to move from animals and birds to humans. Increasing global connectivity simply catalyses this process, as much as it catalyses economic growth.

WHO coordinates health research, clinical trials, drug safety, vaccine development, surveillance, virus sharing, etc. The importance of WHO’s work on immunisation across the globe, especially with HIV, can hardly be overstated. It has a rich track record of collaborating with private-sector organisations to advance research and development of health solutions and improving their access in the global south.

It discharges its duties while maintaining a dynamic equilibrium between such diverse and powerful forces as national securities, economic interests, human rights and ethics. COVID-19 has highlighted how political calculations can hamper data-sharing and mitigation efforts within and across national borders, and WHO often simply becomes a convenient political scapegoat in such situations.

International Health Regulations, a 2005 agreement between 196 countries to work together for global health security, focuses on detection, assessment and reporting of public health events, and also includes non-pharmaceutical interventions such as travel and trade restrictions. WHO coordinates and helps build capacity to implement IHR.

#### WHO diplomacy solves great power conflict

Murphy 20 [(Chris, U.S. senator from Connecticut serving on the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee) “The Answer is to Empower, Not Attack, the World Health Organization,” War on the Rocks, 4/21/2020] JL

The World Health Organization is critical to stopping disease outbreaks and strengthening public health systems in developing countries, where COVID-19 is starting to appear. Yemen announced its first infection earlier this month, and other countries in Africa, Asia and the Middle East are at severe risk. Millions of refugees rely on the World Health Organization for their health care, and millions of children rely on the WHO and UNICEF to access vaccines.

The World Health Organization is not perfect, but its team of doctors and public health experts have had major successes. Their most impressive claim to fame is the eradication of smallpox – no small feat. More recently, the World Health Organization has led an effort to rid the world of two of the three strains of polio, and they are close to completing the trifecta.

These investments are not just the right thing to do; they benefit the United States. Improving health outcomes abroad provides greater political and economic stability, increasing demand for U.S. exports. And, as we are all learning now, it is in America’s national security interest for countries to effectively detect and respond to potential pandemics before they reach our shores.

As the United States looks to develop a new global system of pandemic prevention, there is absolutely no way to do that job without the World Health Organization. Uniquely, it puts traditional adversaries – like Russia and the United States, India and Pakistan, or Iran and Saudi Arabia – all around the same big table to take on global health challenges. It has relationships with the public health leaders of every nation, decades of experience in tackling viruses and diseases, and the ability to bring countries together to tackle big projects. This ability to bridge divides and work across borders cannot be torn down and recreated – not in today’s environment of major power competition – and so there is simply no way to build an effective international anti-pandemic infrastructure without the World Health Organization at the center.

#### Ought means should

Merriam Webster n.d. – Merriam Webster’s Learner’s Dictionary, “ought”, <http://www.learnersdictionary.com/definition/ought>  
ought /ˈɑːt/ verb  
Learner's definition of OUGHT [modal verb] 1 ◊ Ought is almost always followed by to and the infinitive form of a verb. The phrase ought to has the same meaning as should and is used in the same ways, but it is less common and somewhat more formal. The negative forms ought not and oughtn't are often used without a following to. — used to indicate what is expected They ought to be here by now. You ought to be able to read this book. There ought to be a gas station on the way. 2 — used to say or suggest what should be done You ought to get some rest. That leak ought to be fixed. You ought to do your homework.

#### Should means must and is immediate

Summers 94 (Justice – Oklahoma Supreme Court, “Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, 1994 OK 123, 11-8, http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13)

¶4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti.[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14) The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.[16](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn16) [CONTINUES – TO FOOTNOTE] [13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn13) "*Should*" not only is used as a "present indicative" synonymous with *ought* but also is the past tense of "shall" with various shades of meaning not always easy to analyze. See 57 C.J. Shall § 9, Judgments § 121 (1932). O. JESPERSEN, GROWTH AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1984); St. Louis & S.F.R. Co. v. Brown, 45 Okl. 143, 144 P. 1075, 1080-81 (1914). For a more detailed explanation, see the Partridge quotation infra note 15. Certain contexts mandate a construction of the term "should" as more than merely indicating preference or desirability. Brown, supra at 1080-81 (jury instructions stating that jurors "should" reduce the amount of damages in proportion to the amount of contributory negligence of the plaintiff was held to imply an *obligation* *and to be more than advisory*); Carrigan v. California Horse Racing Board, 60 Wash. App. 79, [802 P.2d 813](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=802&box2=P.2D&box3=813) (1990) (one of the Rules of Appellate Procedure requiring that a party "should devote a section of the brief to the request for the fee or expenses" was interpreted to mean that a party is under an *obligation* to include the requested segment); State v. Rack, 318 S.W.2d 211, 215 (Mo. 1958) ("should" would mean the same as "shall" or "must" when used in an instruction to the jury which tells the triers they "should disregard false testimony"). [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) In praesenti means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is presently or immediately effective, as opposed to something that will or would become effective in the future *[in futurol*]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

### Case

#### 1] Framework – the role of the ballot is to determine whether the plan is a good idea through evaluation of consequences. Anything else is self-serving, arbitrary and begs the question of the rest of the debate.

Christopher A. Bracey 6, Associate Professor of Law, Associate Professor of African & African American Studies, Washington University in St. Louis, September, Southern California Law Review, 79 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1231, p. 1318

Second, reducing conversation on race matters to an ideological contest allows opponents to elide inquiry into whether the results of a particular preference policy are desirable. Policy positions masquerading as principled ideological stances create the impression that a racial policy is not simply a choice among available alternatives, but the embodiment of some higher moral principle. Thus, the "principle" becomes an end in itself, without reference to outcomes. Consider the prevailing view of colorblindness in constitutional discourse. Colorblindness has come to be understood as the embodiment of what is morally just, independent of its actual effect upon the lives of racial minorities. This explains Justice Thomas's belief in the "moral and constitutional equivalence" between Jim Crow laws and race preferences, and his tragic assertion that "Government cannot make us equal [but] can only recognize, respect, and protect us as equal before the law." [281](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=cd9713b340d60abd42c2b34c36d8ef95&_docnum=9&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkVA&_md5=9645fa92f5740655bdc1c9ae7c82b328) For Thomas, there is no meaningful difference between laws designed to entrench racial subordination and those designed to alleviate conditions of oppression. Critics may point out that colorblindness in practice has the effect of entrenching existing racial disparities in health, wealth, and society. But in framing the debate in purely ideological terms, opponents are able to avoid the contentious issue of outcomes and make viability determinations based exclusively on whether racially progressive measures exude fidelity to the ideological principle of colorblindness. Meaningful policy debate is replaced by ideological exchange, which further exacerbates hostilities and deepens the cycle of resentment.

#### Double bind – either only member states cant patent in which case they definitely cant solve – actors within states cant – OR we get competition because indigenmosu peoples groups geographically within nations – US doesn’t categorize grousp as saovering subject to law – even if they should be

* Say actors cant patent

#### Their rotb just indicates there’s an imperative to take legal action to resolve appropriation but that 1. Doesn’t preclude the importance of other impacts 2. Relies on a consequential calculus to prove why the obligation exists 3. Is arbitrary and impact justified

#### Reps don’t shape reality – justifying a policy in 2 ways is still the same policy – leads to endless abstraction

#### 2] Don’t let them weigh the sum total of their impact—they only get to weigh the unique amount solved by the affirmative. Filter the debate through scope of solvency—there’s no impact to root cause if they don’t solve it

#### 3] No performative or methodological offense, only offense from the plan—reject it cuz it explodes predictable limits, spiking out of neg ground making any discussion qualitatively worse

#### 4] Our impacts matter

#### A] Focus on large scale catastrophes is good and they outweigh – appeals to social costs, moral rules, and securitization play into cognitive biases and flawed risk calculus – 2020 is living proof

Weber 20 (ELKE U. WEBER is Gerhard R. Andlinger Professor in Energy and the Environment and Professor of Psychology and Public Affairs at Princeton University.), November-December 2020 Issue, "Heads in the Sand," Foreign Affairs, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2020-10-13/heads-sand> mvp

We are living in a time of crisis. From the immediate challenge of the COVID-19 pandemic to the looming existential threat of climate change, the world is grappling with massive global dangers—to say nothing of countless problems within countries, such as inequality, cyberattacks, unemployment, systemic racism, and obesity. In any given crisis, the right response is often clear. Wear a mask and keep away from other people. Burn less fossil fuel. Redistribute income. Protect digital infrastructure. The answers are out there. What’s lacking are governments that can translate them into actual policy. As a result, the crises continue. The death toll from the pandemic skyrockets, and the world makes dangerously slow progress on climate change, and so on.

It’s no secret how governments should react in times of crisis. First, they need to be nimble. Nimble means moving quickly, because problems often grow at exponential rates: a contagious virus, for example, or greenhouse gas emissions. That makes early action crucial and procrastination disastrous. Nimble also means adaptive. Policymakers need to continuously adjust their responses to crises as they learn from their own experience and from the work of scientists. Second, governments need to act wisely. That means incorporating the full range of scientific knowledge available about the problem at hand. It means embracing uncertainty, rather than willfully ignoring it. And it means thinking in terms of a long time horizon, rather than merely until the next election. But so often, policymakers are anything but nimble and wise. They are slow, inflexible, uninformed, overconfident, and myopic.

Why is everyone doing so badly? Part of the explanation lies in the inherent qualities of crises. Crises typically require navigating between risks. In the COVID-19 pandemic, policymakers want to save lives and jobs. With climate change, they seek a balance between avoiding extreme weather and allowing economic growth. Such tradeoffs are hard as it is, and they are further complicated by the fact that costs and benefits are not evenly distributed among stakeholders, making conflict a seemingly unavoidable part of any policy choice. Vested interests attempt to forestall needed action, using their money to influence decision-makers and the media. To make matters worse, policymakers must pay sustained attention to multiple issues and multiple constituencies over time. They must accept large amounts of uncertainty. Often, then, the easiest response is to stick with the status quo. But that can be a singularly dangerous response to many new hazards. After all, with the pandemic, business as usual would mean no social distancing. With climate change, it would mean continuing to burn fossil fuels.

But the explanation for humanity’s woeful response to crises goes beyond politics and incentives. To truly understand the failure to act, one must turn to human psychology. It is there that one can grasp the full impediments to proper decision-making—the cognitive biases, emotional reactions, and suboptimal shortcuts that hold policymakers back—and the tools to overcome them.

AVOIDING THE UNCOMFORTABLE

People are singularly bad at predicting and preparing for catastrophes. Many of these events are “black swans,” rare and unpredictable occurrences that most people find difficult to imagine, seemingly falling into the realm of science fiction. Others are “gray rhinos,” large and not uncommon threats that are still neglected until they stare you in the face (such as a coronavirus outbreak). Then there are “invisible gorillas,” threats in full view that should be noticed but aren’t—so named for a psychological experiment in which subjects watching a clip of a basketball game were so fixated on the players that they missed a person in a gorilla costume walking through the frame. Even professional forecasters, including security analysts, have a poor track record when it comes to accurately anticipating events. The COVID-19 crisis, in which a dystopic science-fiction narrative came to life and took everyone by surprise, serves as a cautionary tale about humans’ inability to foresee important events.

Not only do humans fail to anticipate crises; they also fail to respond rationally to them. At best, people display “bounded rationality,” the idea that instead of carefully considering their options and making perfectly rational decisions that optimize their preferences, humans in the real world act quickly and imperfectly, limited as they are by time and cognitive capacity. Add in the stress generated by crises, and their performance gets even worse.

Because humans don’t have enough time, information, or processing power to deliberate rationally, they have evolved easier ways of making decisions. They rely on their emotions, which serve as an early warning system of sorts: alerting people that they are in a positive context that can be explored and exploited or in a negative context where fight or flight is the appropriate response. They also rely on rules. To simplify decision-making, they might follow standard operating procedures or abide by some sort of moral code. They might decide to imitate the action taken by other people whom they trust or admire. They might follow what they perceive to be widespread norms. Out of habit, they might continue to do what they have been doing unless there is overwhelming evidence against it.

Not only do humans fail to anticipate crises; they also fail to respond rationally to them.

Humans evolved these shortcuts because they require little effort and work well in a broad range of situations. Without access to a real-time map of prey in different hunting grounds, for example, a prehistoric hunter might have resorted to a simple rule of thumb: look for animals where his fellow tribesmen found them yesterday. But in times of crisis, emotions and rules are not always helpful drivers of decision-making. High stakes, uncertainty, tradeoffs, and conflict—all elicit negative emotions, which can impede wise responses. Uncertainty is scary, as it signals an inability to predict what will happen, and what cannot be predicted might be deadly. The vast majority of people are already risk averse under normal circumstances. Under stress, they become even more so, and they retreat to the familiar comfort of the status quo. From gun laws to fossil fuel subsidies, once a piece of legislation is in place, it is hard to dislodge it, even when cost-benefit analysis argues for change.

#### Can’t solve – removing patents just makes all applications of IK functionally generics – that GREENLIGHTS corporations to appropriate them and doesn’t do anything to protect knowledge beyond slightly decreasing profit incentives – the plan does nothing to detach IK from capital

#### Blood quantum DA – settler states are the actors of the plan so they have jurisdiction over what is and isn’t Indigenous Knowledge – its really to trace back medicines to any possible Indigenous roots which incentivizes nations to say substances and knowledge “aren’t native enough” which decks aff solvency AND perpetuates a form of cultural genocide

#### No developing country competition – even if they aren’t barred from plant based generics through patents, there are massive disparities in R&D capabilities and pharmaceutical industry size that allow the global north to dominate

#### Joint statement is 1. Answered by our CP which cites Indigenous groups utilizing patents to protect their knowledge 2. Relies on Indigenous legal systems to protect knowledge which can only deter settler appropriation if its codified in settler law

#### Spillover from the held ev is nonsense – explain how the plan or its reps – also don’t largely change legal forums and if they do both cps do as well