# 1NC Valley R1

## 1

### T Reduce

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

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

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

#### Waiver is temporary.

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

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

#### 2] Violation – the plan waives intellectual property protections “during pandemics”, which is an suspension – don’t let them get We Meets since their Plan defends a waiver.

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

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

#### 5] Paradigm Issues –

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

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

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

## 2

### Util NC

#### Ethics begin a posteriori.

#### 1. Knowledge is based on experience – I wouldn’t know 2+2=4 without experience of objects nor the color red without some experience of color. We can’t obtain evidence of goodness without experience.

#### 2. Indifference – Even if there are apriori moral truths, I can choose to ignore them. Cognition is binding – if I put my hand on a hot stove, I can’t turn off my natural aversion to it.

#### The standard is act hedonistic util. Prefer –

#### 1 – Pleasure and pain *are* intrinsic value and disvalue – everything else *regresses* – robust neuroscience.

Blum et al. 18

Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>, R.S.

**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10].

Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14].

Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals.

Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D

Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it.

It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring.

Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding.

There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health.

Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage.

Finding happiness is different between apes and humans

As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure.

Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even produce **the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered.

Desire and reward centers

It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation.

In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41].

Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42].

Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans.

In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45].

Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations.

Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50]

In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders.

In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS.

Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### 2 – No intent-foresight distinction – if I foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of my deliberation since its intrinsic to my action

#### 3 – Actor spec – governments lack wills or intentions and inevitably deals with tradeoffs – outweighs because agents have differing obligations.

#### 4 – No act omission distinction – choosing not to act is an action in of itself since you had to make an active decision to omit. Walking past a drowning baby and choosing not to save it is a cognitive decision you were faced with and you actively decided to keep walking b) warranting a distinction gives agents the permissible choice of omitting from any ethical action since omissions lack culpability.

#### No calc indicts – a) no philosophy actually says that consequences don’t matter at all since otherwise it would indict every theory since they use causal events to understand how their ethics have worked in the past and through the justification of premises b) we don’t need consequences – winning hedonism proves we’re the only one with impacts to it which means risk of offense framing is sufficient c) they’re blippy nibs that set the aff at an unfair advantage since they only have to win one while we have to beat them all – voting issue for fairness

#### Extinction first –

#### 1 – Turns suffering – mass death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities

#### 2 – Forecloses future improvement – we can never improve society because our impact is irreversible which proves moral uncertainty. Moral uncertainty outweighs, if you’re unsure which side to err on the framework debate you should preserve the world to continue deliberation. It also means if choosing between a freedom violation and everyone dying you should err on the side of preserving life, comparative risks matter which proves epistemic modesty is good

#### 3 – Objectivity – body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical

#### 4 – Is offense under kant, freedom presupposes the inevitable guarantee of life and threat of death means people cant pursue ends since their constantly worrying about external obligations and constraints

## 3

### CP

#### CP Text: The World Trade Organization ought to increase intellectual property protections for medicines during pandemics. The United States ought to designate intellectual property protections on medicines during pandemics as adversely affecting the international transfer of technology.

#### Member states can waive IP rights if they hamper the international flow of medical technology.

WTO ’21 (World Trade Organization; 2021; “Obligations and exceptions”; World Trade Organization; Accessed: 8-30-2021; exact date not provided, but copyright was updated in 2021)

Article 8 Principles […] 2. Appropriate measures, provided that they are consistent with the provisions of this Agreement, **may be needed** to prevent the abuse of intellectual property rights by right holders or the resort to practices which unreasonably restrain trade or **adversely affect** the **international transfer of technology**. SECTION 8: CONTROL OF ANTI-COMPETITIVE PRACTICES IN CONTRACTUAL LICENCES Article 40 1. Members agree that some licensing practices or conditions pertaining to intellectual property rights which restrain competition may have **adverse effects on trade** and **may impede** the **transfer and dissemination** of technology. 2. Nothing in this Agreement **shall prevent** Members from specifying in their legislation licensing practices or conditions that may in particular cases constitute an abuse of intellectual property rights having an adverse effect on competition in the relevant market. As provided above, a Member **may adopt**, consistently with the other provisions of this Agreement, **appropriate measures** to **prevent or control** such practices, which may include for example exclusive grantback conditions, conditions preventing challenges to validity and coercive package licensing, in the light of the relevant laws and regulations of that Member. […]

#### Designating IP protections as antithetical to the global health system revitalizes info-sharing.

Youde ’16 (Jeremy; writer for World Politics Review; 4-29-2016; “Technology **Transfer** Is a **Weak Link** in the Global Health System”; World Politics Review; <https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/18639/technology-transfer-is-a-weak-link-in-the-global-health-system>; Accessed: 8-30-2021)

In mid-April, a spokesperson for the Ugandan government admitted that the country’s only functioning cancer treatment machine had broken earlier that month. The radiotherapy machine, donated by China to Uganda in 1995 and housed at Mulago Hospital in Kampala, is now considered beyond repair. While the government did acquire a second radiotherapy machine in 2013, it has not been operational because of delays in allocating 30 billion shillings—just shy of $9 million—to construct a new building to house it. The funding delay has lifted, but the machine won’t be up and running for at least six months. The government has announced plans to airlift some cancer patients to Nairobi for treatment, but that plan will only accommodate 400 of the estimated 17,000 to 33,000 cancer patients who need treatment annually in Uganda. This breakdown of technology is a human tragedy for the cancer patients from Uganda as well as elsewhere in East Africa that the radiotherapy machine helped treat. Beyond the personal level, though, the episode illustrates a larger shortcoming in global health. Total annual development assistance for health is approximately $36 billion, but that funding is overwhelmingly concentrated on specific infectious diseases. Noncommunicable diseases like cancer receive relatively little international funding—only 1.3 percent in 2015, and the dollar amount has declined since 2013. Funds to strengthen health systems, geared toward building and supporting a resilient health care system, are similarly low, making up only 7.3 percent of development assistance in 2015. Noncommunicable diseases kill more people every year than infectious diseases and accidents do, but this balance is not reflected in global health spending. ... These shortcomings also speak to larger problems in global health around issues of **technology transfers** and long-term **commitments** to keep that technology working. It’s one thing to provide necessary medical technologies in the first place; it’s another to ensure that those technologies are accessible and operational going forward. Despite the **importance** of technology transfers, questions of **long-term support** for them have received relatively little attention from the global health regime. As noncommunicable diseases like cancer cause an even-higher proportion of deaths each year, it will become all the more **imperative** that the international community address this gap in **sharing** and funding **crucial health care** technology. This does not mean that there are no efforts to facilitate technology transfers around the world. The Fogarty International Center, a part of the U.S. National Institutes of Health, has had an [Office of Technology Transfer](http://www.fic.nih.gov/News/GlobalHealthMatters/march-april-2014/Pages/technology-transfer-nih-ott.aspx) since 1989 to make medical innovations developed in the United States more widely available. The World Health Organization (WHO) also has a [Technology Transfer Initiative](http://www.who.int/phi/programme_technology_transfer/en/) to improve access to health care technologies in developing countries. These efforts are laudable, but their interpretation of technology transfer is almost entirely rooted in access to pharmaceuticals and vaccines. To be sure, that is a very important issue—but it only deals with one narrow element of technology transfer. The problems of global health technology transfers illustrated in Uganda underscore a larger issue: the need for a so-called fourth industrial revolution, what has been described as “blurring the real world with the technological world.” This idea gained prominence earlier this year when it served as the theme for the World Economic Forum in Davos. For global health, this means embracing technology to find low-cost ways to promote health, spread education, and reach communities whose access to the health care infrastructure is weak. It expands on the notion of telemedicine and eHealth to make it more encompassing. According to health care entrepreneur Jonathan Jackson, the fourth industrial revolution could change global health by encouraging a shift in focus “from healthcare to health promotion.” Moving from high-cost treatment to low-cost prevention, he has argued, will have significant and far-reaching positive economic implications for developing countries around the world. Its inspiring sense of technological optimism notwithstanding, this sort of approach cannot be the sole focus of technology transfers in global health. Prevention is indeed important, but the fact of the matter remains that people will get sick—and those sick people will need treatment. Mobile applications and electronic access to health care providers can be useful, but they cannot replace a radiotherapy machine. Understanding the root causes of noncommunicable diseases goes far beyond individual choices and intersects with the larger political, economic and social context, so we cannot assume that cybertechnology alone can stop cancer. It is also important to remember that the results of greater technological innovation and integration won’t be free. Sub-Saharan African states, on average, spend $200 per person per year on health care. Even if technology allows costs to decline, they are still likely to be out of reach for many people in most of these countries—in the same way that the purchase and maintenance of medical technologies are prohibitively expensive in these same states today. Technology in and of itself is not useful unless it can be maintained over the long term. This, then, is a weak link in the larger global health system: How do we ensure access to life-prolonging medical technologies beyond pharmaceuticals and vaccines in a sustainable way? Consider two ideas. First, development assistance for health must orient more of its resources toward treating noncommunicable diseases and strengthening health systems. These are the areas in which these technologies are likely to be used, but are not currently supported by the international system. The changing nature of health and disease will only make them even more important in the years to come. Second, longer-term funding commitments would provide a greater opportunity to incorporate medical technologies into health care systems sustainably. Machines will break down, and technologies will fail. That is inevitable. But the global health regime, from the WHO and its regional organizations like the Regional Office for Africa to major donors like the **U**nited **S**tates government and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, needs to figure out how to ensure that these problems do not put **lives in peril**. Technology alone will not improve global health unless it is properly supported and funded.

#### International collaboration’s key to check future pandemics – otherwise, extinction.

Dulaney ’20 [Michael; digital journalist with the ABC June 2020; "'A question of when, not if': Another pandemic is coming – and sooner than we think", No Publication; https://www.abc.net.au/news/science/2020-06-07/a-matter-of-when-not-if-the-next-pandemic-is-around-the-corner/12313372, accessed 4-12-2021]

And as recently as September last year — just a few months before COVID-19 was detected in China — an independent watchdog set up by the WHO warned the world was "grossly" unprepared for the "very real threat" of a pandemic. But even more alarming is what the new coronavirus indicates about the future. Researchers say human impacts on the natural world are causing new infectious diseases to emerge more frequently than ever before, meaning the next pandemic — one perhaps even worse than COVID-19 — is only a matter of time. "We know that it's a probability, not a possibility," Dr Reid says. "The roulette wheel will start to spin again. "If you don't resolve the conditions that generated the problem, then we sit waiting for the next probability equation to come through. "And it will, and sadly it's possible that it's in our lifetime." The growing threat to human health Nearly all emerging pathogens like COVID-19 come from "zoonotic transfer" — essentially, when a virus present in animals jumps to infect humans. The US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates three out of every four new infectious diseases, and nearly all pandemics, emerge this way. Researchers have counted around 200 infectious diseases that have broken out more than 12,000 times over the past three decades. On average, one new infectious disease jumps to humans every four months. Animal species like civet cats (SARS), camels (MERS), horses (Hendra), pigs (Nipah) and chimpanzees (HIV) have all been implicated in the spread of new viruses at different times.

#### CP is offense under Kant, the Hale evidence is about people not being able to freely pursue ends in healthcare. International transfer of medical technology violates that since it allows large corps to control medical advances making individuals abilities to pursue ends in health care impossible bc they don’t have necessary resources. It’s a stronger IL because the aff can’t solve transfer of tech so their offense is non unique but we address the problem from the root which is pharma companies disproportionately controlling distribution of resources not just in terms of IP but all medicinal resources in health care, facilitating a shift to info sharing solves which is youde.

## 4

### CP

#### CP: Member nations of the World Trade Organization should enter into a prior and binding consultation with the World Health Organization over reducing intellectual property protections for medicines for COVID-19. Member nations will support the proposal and adopt the results of consultation.

#### WHO says yes

Kimball 5/7 [(Spencer, news editor with CNBC.com) “WHO chief urges world to follow U.S. lead and support waiving Covid vaccine patent protections,” CNBC, 5/7/2021] JL

World Health Organization Director General-Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus on Friday urged other countries, particularly the Group of Seven industrialized nations, to follow the U.S. example and support a World Trade Organization motion to temporarily waive Covid-19 vaccine patent protections.

“Wednesday’s announcement by the U.S. that it will support a temporary waiver of intellectual property protections for Covid-19 vaccines is a significant statement of solidarity and support for vaccine equity,” Tedros said at a press briefing. “I know that this is not a politically easy thing to do, so I very much appreciate the leadership of the U.S. and we urge other countries to follow their example.”

#### Preempting the inevitable “won’t say yes for other pandemics” WHO supported waivers for covid because of how large scale and destructive it was. If large scale pandemics escalate enough they’ll follow suit which means either we solve the aff or the aff can’t solve themselves since technically anything can be labeled a pandemic which proves a massive link to innovation. WHO saying no to small scale outbreak wouldn’t matter because those don’t escalate enough to trigger existential risks and we’ll naturally avert them.

#### Consultation displays strong leadership, authority, and cohesion among member states which are 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.

#### Extinction – defense is wrong

Piers Millett 17, Consultant for the World Health Organization, PhD in International Relations and Affairs, University of Bradford, Andrew Snyder-Beattie, “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity”, Health Security, Vol 15(4), http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/hs.2017.0028

Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3 while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world’s population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization.

A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to remote populations, overcome rare genetic resistances, and evade detection, cures, and countermeasures. Even evolution itself may work in humanity’s favor: Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off, and so evolutionary pressures could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6

While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they do not rule the possibility out entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of species going extinct due to disease—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include native American tribes exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and theWestern Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population).

In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But many diseases are proof of principle that each worst-case attribute can be realized independently. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, natural evolution would be an unlikely source for pathogens with the highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach. But advances in biotechnology might allow the creation of diseases that combine such traits. Recent controversy has already emerged over a number of scientific experiments that resulted in viruses with enhanced transmissibility, lethality, and/or the ability to overcome therapeutics.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-2

#### 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.

#### CP solves the case and is offense under Kant, the Farr evidence which is the only real card that explains their syllogism makes a claim about individuals not being able to make actions that exclude other bodies, the aff excludes the WHO from pursuing their ends on IP, the CP incentivizes consultation between both multilateral groups which allows for more free will and turns the aff.

## Case

### Hedge

#### 1. no 1ar theory and if they get it implicit neg flex standard on all their offense- no timeskew since we both get 13 min speaking time, aff gets first and last word, means they have a persuasiveness advantage which 2n collapse doesn’t check cause no 3n, they set the playing field with advocacy choice, neg is reactive, and they get infinite prep. Skew inevitable- all args are designed to skew the aff. Being neg is harder on this topic since DA’s are nonunique. This answers all aff flex warrants.

#### 3. We get new responses to 1ac spikes and evaluate embedded clash- none of the args are complete or contextualized and we’re reactive- their interp incentivizes blip storms of spikes which win b/c they’re dropped, not cause they’re true- turns norming and deterrence.

#### 5. Evaluate strength of link- minor skews don’t access their fairness or education offense so they must demonstrate irreparable skew.

### Framework

#### 1. Shmagency—people can always just choose not to be an agent and shift out of their obligations which means their theory can never hold anyone culpable and permits atrocities

#### 2. Tailoring—you can always tailor a rule to be more and more particular to the point where any action is ok because of how specific the rule is

#### 3. Actor spec—even if their framework is true, it only applies to individuals which have unified consciousnesses – our framework is more particular to institutions that are responsible for everything in the public sphere and have an obligation to mitigate inequality

#### No naturalistic fallacy pleasure guides action since we ought not cause pain and we ought to increase pleasure

#### No warrants or empirics for uncertainty means you err neg plus this would just trigger skep since we couldn’t be responsible for moral actions – skep is a voting issue for safety since it would justify someone saying the n word with no reperuccusion – safety ows it’s a apriori responsibility of the judge to maintain it

#### Util is also unescapabler since you cant turn your biological imperatives off, answers universality but winning defense to their syllogism means universality is also wrong. No justification for why ethics is impossible without it

#### They say action theory -

#### No implication to action, just proves that reason is used to explain actions not why it ought to come first

#### Turn, we decide a course of action based on material circumstances so util controls the internal link to intending an action in the first place

**Performativity is false – we don’t deny freedom we just don’t forefront it on our ethical theory – plus people can always say no to your theory but they cant to ours**

**Const authority**

**No infinite consequences since we only hjold people responsible for foreseen consequences which also answers the c point – im only responsible for the immediate actions ive taken**

**Governments can calculate deaths and we can aggregate dopamine which answers the f point**

**Consequences don’t fail – top level all these arguments are blippy nibs with no warrant so err neg**

**Predictions solve action guidance. And the 3 arguments above all disprove it, induction desnt fail it’s a maxim of truth and they assume induction is true by reading an aff and assuming you evaluate it, that answers probability doesn’t solve for induction, relative probability lets us test different scenarios, causation is the same as inf consequnecs and its not a binarism certain extens of it work, you can aggregate dopamine and you don’t need to, abstract principles don’t disprove the truth value of util but rather objective principles i.e. we should avoid headaches and migraines do. Kant can**

**No tjfs –**

**if we prove your theory is false then it turns your standards since those assume Kantianism is true – . Also allows you to conflate philosophical discussions w theory ones which moots phil ed.**

**Turn util is better for resource disparities since most debaters are policy debaters so new debaters can get stuff from the wiki and kant is really confusing and requires things like coaching to learn – people cant win debates on their own if they have no knowledge of what kant is in the first place**

#### Their framework assumes materiality good, they cant conclude that murdering someone is bad or violating freedom is bad without an empirical understanding of what freedom looks like based on material consequences of freedom being violated.

#### P and P are bad, there is always a marginal risk of offense and if not the solution is not to gutcheck a certain side, its

### Offense

#### 2]The aff violates the categorical imperative and is non-universalizable- governments have a binding obligation to protect creations

**Van Dyke 18** Raymond Van Dyke, 7-17-2018, "The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting," IPWatchdog, <https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/> SJ//DA recut SJKS

As we shall see, applying **Kantian logic entails first acknowledging some basic principles; that the people have a right to express themselves, that that expression (the fruits of their labor) has value and is theirs (unless consent is given otherwise), and that government is obligated to protect people and their property. Thus, an inventor or creator has a right in their own creation, which cannot be taken from them without their consent.** So, employing this canon, **a proposed Categorical Imperative (CI) is the following Statement: creators should be protected against the unlawful taking of their creation by others. Applying this Statement to everyone, i.e., does the Statement hold water if everyone does this, leads to a yes determination. Whether a child, a book or a prototype, creations of all sorts should be protected, and this CI stands.** This result also dovetails with the purpose of government: to protect the people and their possessions by providing laws to that effect, whether for the protection of tangible or intangible things. **However, a contrary proposal can be postulated: everyone should be able to use the creations of another without charge. Can this Statement rise to the level of a CI? This proposal, upon analysis would also lead to chaos. Hollywood, for example, unable to protect their films, television shows or any content, would either be out of business or have robust encryption and other trade secret protections, which would seriously undermine content distribution and consumer enjoyment.** Likewise, inventors, unable to license or sell their innovations or make any money to cover R&D, would not bother to invent or also resort to strong trade secret. Why even create? This approach thus undermines and greatly hinders the distribution of ideas in a free society, which is contrary to the paradigm of the U.S. patent and copyright systems, which promotes dissemination. By allowing freeriding, innovation and creativity would be thwarted (or at least not encouraged) and trade secret protection would become the mainstay for society with the heightened distrust.

### Advantage 1

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

Conrad 5-18 John Conrad 5-18-2021 "Waiving intellectual property rights is not in the best interests of patients" <https://archive.is/vsNXv#selection-5353.0-5364.0> (president and CEO of the Illinois Biotechnology Innovation Organization in Chicago.)//Elmer

The Biden's administration's support for India and South Africa's proposal before the World Trade Organization to temporarily waive anti-COVID vaccine patents to boost its supply will fuel the **development of counterfeit vaccines and weaken the already strained global supply chain**. The proposal will not increase the effective number of COVID-19 vaccines in India and other countries. The manufacturing standards to produce COVID-19 vaccines are **exceptionally complicated**; it is unlike any other manufacturing process. To ensure patient safety and efficacy, only manufacturers with the **proper facilities and training should produce the vaccine, and they are**. Allowing a temporary waiver that permits compulsory licensing to allow a manufacturer to export counterfeit vaccines will **cause confusion and endanger public health**. For example, between 60,000 and 80,000 children in Niger with fatal falciparum malaria were treated with a counterfeit vaccine containing incorrect active pharmaceutical ingredients, resulting in more than **100 fatal infections.** Beyond the patients impacted, counterfeit drugs erode public confidence in health care systems and the pharmaceutical industry. Vaccine hesitancy is a rampant threat that feeds off of the distribution of misinformation. Allowing the production of vaccines from improper manufacturing facilities further opens the door for antivaccine hacks to stoke the fear fueling **vaccine hesitance**.

#### 2] Lack of key supplies

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

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

### WTO Advantage

#### 1] No Brink Scenario – no explanations of conflicts/tensions that are escalating now.

#### 2] China thumps Compliance – they’ll never listen.

Webster 14, Timothy. "Paper compliance: How China implements WTO decisions." Mich. J. Int'l L. 35 (2014): 525. (Director of East Asian Legal Studies & Assistant Professor of Law, Case Western Reserve University)//Elmer

Since the number of WTO cases involving China is small, certitude about China's future conduct in the DSB would be inapt. But certain patterns are clear. First, in the majority of cases, China has revised its legal and regulatory systems to comply with the DSB rulings. It has done so typically within the reasonable period of time in which it agreed to do so and has accumulated a strong record in terms of the quality of its implementation. Moreover, as of July 2013, no Chi-nese case has gone into compliance proceedings, wherein an arbitration panel determines the costs of one country's non-compliance to other WTO members. This is a significant difference from other major trading partners, such as the United States, E.U., and Japan, all of which have been respondents in compliance proceedings. n256 Some of these cases have dragged on for more than a decade, indicating a resistance to WTO rulings far and above anything that China has exhibited. Second, **China has found ways to resist WTO rulings** and norms. Inconsistent regulations remain in effect. In the three cases discussed above - DS 362 (intellectual property enforcement), DS 363 (trading rights for publications) DS 373 (financial information services) - inconsistent regulations either continue in effect or were revised so as not to ef-fectuate [\*573] the purpose of the ruling. This lacuna could be a function of institutional capacity. China's capa-cious bureaucratic institutions produce reams of regulations; it is unclear whether many of them keep close tabs on the various regulations they produce, and quite definite that some of them have not repealed regulations found to be in-consistent. Or there may be a more sinister explanation: **China wants to keep the inconsistent regulations** in place, and understands that its regulatory maze may be **too labyrinthine for** other **WTO** members **to navigate**. Whether by design or neglect, a number of inconsistent regulations continue to plague China's compliance record. Moreover, local and provincial-level regulations often amplify the effects of inconsistent national regulations. In cases such as DS 363 and DS 373, lower-level government agencies have promulgated policies that reference regulations that were either revoked or found inconsistent. This means that WTO-inconsistent regulations will cast a regulatory afterglow at various levels of the Chinese legal system. The most striking case of non-compliance, so far, has been the trading rights case (DS 363). The revisions suggest-ed by the DSB challenged China's censorship regime and long-held monopoly on cultural information. Not only did China not comply within a reasonable period of time, but it also left in place several regulations that the DSB deemed inconsistent with WTO disciplines. This suggests that, in particularly sensitive areas, China will not fulfill its implemen-tation obligations. **As China continues to gain experience with WTO litigation**, **instances of non-implementation are likely to increase**. China has, in essence, learned that it can "get away" without fully complying with DSB rulings and recommendations. Indeed, as noted above, two recent rulings show just how far China is willing to push the implemen-tation envelope. Third, reforming laws in China means less than it would in Western liberal democracies with robust legal institu-tions. One-party rule, coupled with a unitary governance structure, allow the party-state to control the passage of laws and regulations, dictate revisions to the domestic legal environment, and coordinate changes with a maximum of speed and minimum of institutional friction. **China** has tinkered with the literal letter of its law, but it **continues** to produce **a whole range of programs that violate WTO** principles. **It is** perhaps **unrealistic to think the DSB can induce compliance** more broadly, that is, outside of the regulation challenged. But it is doubtful that China's domestication of DSB rulings has meaningfully influenced the development of its political economy. Many basic norms - market capitalism, dereg-ulation, strong protection of intellectual property, limits on subsidies - remain alien to China. Fourth, many WTO violations take place in the interstices of law, areas where government officials exercise discre-tion: whether or not to register a foreign company, to issue it a business license, or to prosecute someone for IP theft. Likewise, **China distributes trade regulations to** governmental **agencies as "internal guidance"** (neibu cankao) that should be published under China's WTO transparency obligations, but in fact [\*574] never are. n257 The dispute set-tlement system provides a very rough tool by which to reshape a member's domestic legal system and to monitor its implementation of WTO commitments. A range of violations takes place, either below the radar or without meaningful recourse for investors or manufacturers outside of China. Finally, China deploys the tactical features of the dispute settlement system to buffer the ruling's impact. China settles "easy" cases early and prolongs decisions that seriously disrupt its political system, harm core economic interests, or require significant internal reform to implement. Like any other national actor, China seeks to maximize its interests and minimize disruptions that international law and institutions may inflict upon its domestic legal and regulatory sys-tems.

#### The WTO’s appellate body no longer exists to mediate disputes, without immediate buy in by states, and no mechanism to make disobedient states obey, the system collapses

Horton, 08/3, Lessons from Trump’s assault on the World Trade Organization, https://www.chathamhouse.org/2021/08/lessons-trumps-assault-world-trade-organization, Chatham House – International Affairs Think Tank, Communications Manager; Project Lead, Common Futures Conversations

The WTO is unique amongst international institutions because it has a powerful enforcement mechanism – the dispute settlement system. However, the fundamental vulnerability is that if powerful states like the US and others won’t participate in the system and be bound by its rules, they quickly risk becoming irrelevant. And that’s the situation we’re in right now with the appellate body crisis, where, without a functioning mechanism to ensure that WTO rules are enforced, the entire system of global trade rules risk collapsing. Ironically, the United States has been the leader of the liberal trading order for the past 70 years, but since Trump, it has become its leading saboteur.

#### A major country operating outside WTO consensus wrecks global trade norms

Bacchus 20 [James Bacchus, member of the Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies, the Distinguished University Professor of Global Affairs and director of the Center for Global Economic and Environmental Opportunity at the University of Central Florida, 12-16-2020, "An Unnecessary Proposal: A WTO Waiver of Intellectual Property Rights for COVID-19 Vaccines," Cato Institute, [https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines]/Kankee](https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines%5d/Kankee)

In a sign of their increasing frustration with global efforts to ensure that all people everywhere will have access to COVID-19 vaccines, several developing countries have asked other members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) to join them in a sweeping waiver of the intellectual property (IP) rights relating to those vaccines. Their waiver request raises anew the recurring debate within the WTO over the right balance between the protection of IP rights and access in poorer countries to urgently needed medicines. But the last thing the WTO needs is another debate over perceived trade obstacles to public health. Unless WTO members reach a consensus, the multilateral trading system may be further complicated.///

by a delay like that in resolving the two‐​decades‐​old dispute between developed and developing countries over the compulsory licensing and generic distribution of HIV/AIDS drugs. A new and contentious “North‐​South” political struggle definitely would not be in the interest of the developed countries, the developing countries, the pharmaceutical companies, or the WTO. Certainly it would not be in the interest of the victims and potential victims of COVID-19. Background In early October 2020, India and South Africa asked the members of the WTO to waive protections in WTO rules for patents, copyrights, industrial designs, and undisclosed information (trade secrets) in relation to the “prevention, containment or treatment of COVID-19 … until widespread vaccination is in place globally, and the majority of the world’s population has developed immunity.”1 India and South Africa want to give all WTO members freedom to refuse to grant or enforce patents and other IP rights relating to COVID-19 vaccines, drugs, diagnostics, and other technologies for the duration of the pandemic. In requesting the waiver, India and South Africa have argued that “an effective response to the COVID-19 pandemic requires rapid access to affordable medical products including diagnostic kits, medical masks, other personal protective equipment and ventilators, as well as vaccines and medicines for the prevention and treatment of patients in dire need.” They have said that “as new diagnostics, therapeutics and vaccines for COVID-19 are developed, there are significant concerns, how these will be made available promptly, in sufficient quantities and at affordable prices to meet global demand.”2 Later in October, the members of the WTO failed to muster the required consensus to move forward with the proposed waiver. The European Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, and other developed countries opposed the waiver request.3 One WTO delegate, from the United Kingdom, described it as “an extreme measure to address an unproven problem.”4 A spokesperson for the European Union explained, “There is no evidence that intellectual property rights are a genuine barrier for accessibility of COVID‐​19‐​related medicines and technologies.”5 In the absence of a consensus, WTO members have decided to postpone further discussion of the proposed waiver until early 2021. Balancing IP Rights and Access to Medicines Not New to WTO This waiver controversy comes nearly two decades after the end of the long battle in the multilateral trading system over access to HIV/AIDS drugs. At the height of the HIV/AIDS crisis at the turn of the century, numerous countries, including especially those from sub‐​Saharan Africa, could not afford the high‐​priced HIV/AIDS drugs patented by pharmaceutical companies in developed countries. Having spent billions of dollars on developing the drugs, the patent holders resisted lowering their prices. The credibility of the companies, the countries that supported them, and the WTO itself were all damaged by an extended controversy over whether patent rights should take precedence over providing affordable medicines for people afflicted by a lethal disease. Article 8 of the WTO Agreement on the Trade‐​Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (the TRIPS Agreement) provides that WTO members “may, in formulating or amending their laws and regulations, adopt measures necessary to protect public health … provided that such measures are consistent with the provisions of this Agreement.” In similar vein, Article 7 of the TRIPS Agreement provides that the “protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights” shall be “in a manner conducive to social and economic welfare.”6 It can be maintained that these two WTO IP rules are significantly capacious to include any reasonable health measures that a WTO member may take during a health emergency, such as a pandemic. Yet there was doubt among the members during the HIV/AIDS crisis about the precise reach of these provisions. As Jennifer Hillman of the Council on Foreign Relations observed, ordinarily the “inherent tension between the protection of intellectual property and the need to make and distribute affordable medicines” is “resolved through licensing, which allows a patent holder to permit others to make or trade the protected product—usually at a price and with some supervision from the patent holder to ensure control.”7 But, in public health emergencies, it may be impossible to obtain a license. In such cases, “compulsory licenses” can be issued to local manufacturers, authorizing them to make patented products or use patented processes even though they do not have the permission of the patent holders.8