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### 1

#### Current WTO legislation on IP rights promotes innovation – if they try to spike out of this, that amplifies the violation on the theory shell – to be clear, theres a violation anyways

Ezell et al 4/29 Jaci McDole, Stephen Ezell [Stephen Ezell is vice president, global innovation policy, at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF). He focuses on science and technology policy, international competitiveness, trade, manufacturing, and services issues.] 4/29/21, “Ten Ways IP Has Enabled Innovations That Have Helped Sustain the World Through the Pandemic” Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, <https://itif.org/publications/2021/04/29/ten-ways-ip-has-enabled-innovations-have-helped-sustain-world-through> DD AG

Although anti-IP proponents have attacked biopharmaceutical manufacturers particularly hard, the reality is all IP-protected innovations are at risk if these rights are ignored, or vitiated. Certain arguments have shown a desire for the term “COVID-19 innovations” to include everything from vaccines, therapeutics, diagnostics, and PPE to biotechnology, AI-related data, and educational materials.14 This could potentially open the floodgates to invalidate IP protection on many of the innovations highlighted in this report.

However, much of the current discussion concerning IP focuses almost entirely on litigation fears or R&D incentives. Although R&D is an important aspect of IP, as previously mentioned, these discussions ignore the fact that IP protection can be—and often is—used for other purposes, including generating initial capital to create a company and begin manufacturing and, more importantly, using licensing agreements and IP to track the supply chain and ensure quality control of products.

In 2018, Forbes identified counterfeiting as the largest criminal enterprise in the world.15 The global struggle against counterfeit and non-regulated products, which has hit Latin America particularly hard during the pandemic, proves the need for safety and quality assurance in supply chains.16 Some communities already ravaged by COVID-19 are seeing higher mortality rates related to counterfeit vaccines, therapeutics, PPE, and cleaning and sanitizing products.17

Polish authorities discovered vials of antiwrinkle treatment labeled as COVID-19 vaccines. 18 In Mexico, fake vaccines sold for approximately $1,000 per dose.19 Chinese and South African police seized thousands of counterfeit vaccine doses from warehouses and manufacturing plants.20 Meanwhile, dozens of websites worldwide claiming to sell vaccines or be affiliated with vaccine manufacturers have been taken down.21 But the problem is not limited to biopharmaceuticals. The National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center has recovered $48 million worth of counterfeit PPE and other products.22

Collaborative efforts between law enforcement and manufacturers have kept numerous counterfeits from reaching the population. In countries with strong IP protection, the chances of counterfeit products reaching the market are significantly lower. This is largely because counterfeiting tends to be an IP-related issue, and these countries generally provide superior means of tracking the supply chain through trademarks, trade secrets, and licensing agreements. This enables greater quality control and helps manufacturers maintain a level of public confidence in their products.

By controlling the flow of knowledge associated with IP, voluntary licensing agreements provide innovators with opportunities to collaborate, while ensuring their partners are properly equipped and capable of producing quality products. Throughout this difficult time, the world has seen unexpected collaborations, especially between biopharmaceutical companies worldwide such as Gilead and Eva Pharma or Bharat Biotech and Ocugen, Inc.

Throughout history, and most significantly in the nineteenth century through the widespread development of patent systems and the ensuing Industrial Revolution, IP has contributed toward greater economic growth.23 This is promising news as the world struggles for economic recovery. A 2021 joint study by the EU Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) and European Patent Office (EPO) shows a strong, positive correlation between IP rights and economic performance.24 It states that “IP-owning firms represent a significantly larger proportion of economic activity and employment across Europe,” with IP-intensive industries contributing to 45 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) (€6.6 trillion; US$7.9 trillion).25 The study also shows 38.9 percent of employment is directly or indirectly attributed to IP-intensive industries, and IP generates higher wages and greater revenue per employee, especially for small-to-medium-sized enterprises.26 That concords with the United States, where the Department of Commerce estimated that IP-intensive industries support at least 45 million jobs and contribute more than $6 trillion dollars to, or 38.2 percent of, GDP.27

In 2020, global patent filings through the World Intellectual Property Organization’s (WIPO) Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) system reached a record 275,900 filings amidst the pandemic, growing 4 percent from 2019.28 The top-four nations, which accounted for 180,530 of the patent applications, were China, the United States, Japan, and Korea, respectively.29 While several countries saw an increase in patent filings, Saudi Arabia and Malaysia both saw significant increases in the number of annual applications, with the top two filing growths of 73 percent and 26 percent, respectively.30

#### Reductions in protections kill medical innovation, economic growth, and knowledge building for the future

McDole and Ezell 04/29 – Jaci McDole is a senior policy analyst covering intellectual property (IP) and innovation policy at ITIF. She focuses on IP and its correlations to global innovation and trade. Her work includes ITIF’s Innovate4Health Initiatives (2017–2019) and A Covid-19 TRIPS Waiver Makes No More Sense for Copyrights Than It Does for Patents (2021). McDole comes to ITIF from the Institute for Intellectual Property Research, an organization she cofounded to study and further robust global IP policies. Stephen J. Ezell is ITIF vice president for Global Innovation Policy. He focuses on science, technology, and innovation policy as well as international competitiveness and trade policy issues. He is the coauthor of Innovating in a Service Driven Economy: Insights Application, and Practice (Palgrave McMillan, 2015) and Innovation Economics: The Race for Global Advantage (Yale 2012). The Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF) is an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan research and educational institute focusing on the intersection of technological innovation and public policy. Recognized by its peers in the think tank community as the global center of excellence for science and technology policy, ITIF’s mission is to formulate and promote policy solutions that accelerate innovation and boost productivity to spur growth, opportunity, and progress; April 29, 2021; “Ten Ways IP Has Enabled Innovations That Have Helped Sustain the World Through the Pandemic”; <https://itif.org/publications/2021/04/29/ten-ways-ip-has-enabled-innovations-have-helped-sustain-world-through> //advay

Innovation can—and does—happen anywhere and at any time. As society ground to a halt in 2020, innovators around the world worked tirelessly to develop treatments, vaccines, and solutions to COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges. From personal protective equipment (PPE) to treatments and vaccines to autonomous delivery robots to remote and social distancing solutions for the workplace, intellectual property (IP) played an indispensable role in enabling research, development, and commercialization of many of the innovations meeting the challenges of the pandemic. IP enables start-ups to gain access to much-needed capital. IP gives innovators the confidence to invest in research and development (R&D) and provides incentives for commercialization. Indeed, it is difficult to innovate without the protection of ideas.

Despite this, some—particularly anti-business IP opponents—have blamed IP rights for a host of problems, including limited access to therapeutics, vaccines, and biotechnology. They offer seemingly simple solutions—weaken or eliminate IP rights—and innovation will flow like manna from heaven. Eliminating IP rights might accelerate the diffusion of some pre-existing innovations, but it would absolutely limit future innovations. Innovators, a bit like Charlie Brown kicking the football held by Lucy, would be wary of trusting governments who might say, “Well, this time we won’t take away your IP rights, so go ahead and invest large amounts of time and money.” Given the nature of COVID-19, nations around the world cannot afford to take this risk. Future pandemics and other challenges for which we will need to rely on IP-protected innovations to overcome are near certain to arise.

Moreover, the blame game usually ignores the real, underlying problems. For access to innovations to fight COVID-19, especially biotechnology, vaccines, and therapeutics, the underlying problems are regulatory delays and a lack of adequate and appropriate manufacturing infrastructure.1 The lack of infrastructure has resulted in supply chain bottlenecks in places where few are currently equipped to handle the manufacturing requirements.2 Meanwhile, regulatory delays have prevented vaccines, therapeutics, and diagnostics from entering certain markets.3

To better understand the role of IP in enabling solutions related to COVID-19 challenges, this report relies on 10 case studies drawn from a variety of nations, technical fields, and firm sizes. This is but a handful of the thousands of IP-enabled innovations that have sprung forth over the past year in an effort to meet the tremendous challenges brought on by COVID-19 globally. From a paramedic in Mexico to a veteran vaccine manufacturing company in India and a tech start-up in Estonia to a U.S.-based company offering workplace Internet of Things (IoT) services, small and large organizations alike are working to combat the pandemic. Some have adapted existing innovations, while others have developed novel solutions. All are working to take the world out of the pandemic and into the future.

The case studies are:

Bharat Biotech: Covaxin

Gilead: Remdesivir

LumiraDX: SARS-COV-2 Antigen POC Test

Teal Bio: Teal Bio Respirator

XE Ingeniería Médica: CápsulaXE

Surgical Theater: Precision VR

Tombot: Jennie

Starship Technologies: Autonomous Delivery Robots

Triax Technologies: Proximity Trace

Zoom: Video Conferencing

As the case studies show, IP is critical to enabling innovation. Policymakers around the world need to ensure robust IP protections are—and remain—in place if they wish their citizens to have safe and innovative solutions to health care, workplace, and societal challenges in the future.

THE ROLE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN R&D-INTENSIVE INDUSTRIES

Intangible assets, such as IP rights, comprised approximately 84 percent of the corporate value of S&P 500 companies in 2018.4 For start-ups, this means much of the capital needed to operate is directly related to IP (see Teal Bio case study for more on this). IP also plays an especially important role for R&D-intensive industries.5

To take the example of the biopharmaceutical industry, it is characterized by high-risk, time-consuming, and expensive processes including basic research, drug discovery, pre-clinical trials, three stages of human clinical trials, regulatory review, and post-approval research and safety monitoring. The drug development process spans an average of 11.5 to 15 years.6 For every 5,000 to 10,000 compounds screened on average during the basic research and drug discovery phases, approximately 250 molecular compounds, or 2.5 to 5 percent, make it to preclinical testing. Out of those 250 molecular compounds, approximately 5 make it to clinical testing. That is, 0.05 to 0.1 percent of drugs make it from basic research into clinical trials. Of those rare few which make it to clinical testing, less than 12 percent are ultimately approved for use by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA).7

In addition to high risks, drug development is costly, and the expenses associated with it are increasing. A 2019 report by the Deloitte Center for Health Solutions concluded that since 2010 the average cost of bringing a new drug to market increased by 67 percent.8 Numerous studies have examined the substantial cost of biopharmaceutical R&D, and most confirm investing in new drug development requires $1.7 billion to $3.2 billion up front on average.9 A 2018 study by the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness found similar risks and figures for vaccines, stating, “In general, vaccine development from discovery to licensure can cost billions of dollars, can take over 10 years to complete, and has an average 94 percent chance of failure.”10 Yet, a 2010 study found that 80 percent of new drugs—that is, the less than 12 percent ultimately approved by the FDA—made less than their capitalized R&D costs.11 Another study found that only 1 percent (maybe three new drugs each year) of the most successful 10 percent of FDA approved drugs generate half of the profits of the entire drug industry.12

To say the least, biopharmaceutical R&D represents a high-stakes, long-term endeavor with precarious returns. Without IP protection, biopharmaceutical manufacturers have little incentive to take the risks necessary to engage in the R&D process because they would be unable to recoup even a fraction of the costs incurred. Diminished revenues also result in reduced investments in R&D which means less research into cancer drugs, Alzheimer cures, vaccines, and more. IP rights give life-sciences enterprises the confidence needed to undertake the difficult, risky, and expensive process of life-sciences innovation secure in the knowledge they can capture a share of the gains from their innovations, which is indispensable not only to recouping the up-front R&D costs of a given drug, but which can generate sufficient profits to enable investment in future generations of biomedical innovation and thus perpetuate the enterprises into the future.13

#### Future pandemics are more likely and more deadly which makes innovation key to stop extinction

Ceballos 5/27 Gerardo Ceballos [PhD, Dr Gerardo Ceballos is an ecologist and conservationist at the Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico. He is particularly recognized for his influential work on global patterns of distribution of diversity, endemism, and extinction risk in vertebrates. He is also well-known for his contribution to understanding the magnitude and impacts of the sixth mass extinction.], 5/27/21, “THE SIXTH MASS EXTINCTION AND THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY”, Population Matters, <https://populationmatters.org/news/2021/05/sixth-mass-extinction-and-future-humanity> DD AG

Somewhere, sometime in late 2019, a coronavirus from a wild species, perhaps a bat or a pangolin, infected a human in China. This could have been an obscure event, lost without trace in the annals of history, as it is very likely this has occurred many times in the last centuries. But this particular event was somehow different. The coronavirus became an epidemic first and a pandemic later. Covid-19 became the worst pandemic since the Spanish flu in 1918. The horrific human suffering it has caused, and its economic, social and political impacts, are still unraveling.

The reason Covid-19 and more than forty other very dangerous viruses, such as Lassa fever, HIV and Ebola, have jumped from wild animals to humans in the last four decades is the destruction of natural environments and the trafficking and consumption of wild animals.

The wildlife trade is to satisfy the insatiable and extravagant demand for these species in the Asian market, in countries such as China, Vietnam and Indonesia. The illegal wildlife trade is a gigantic business. It is as lucrative as the drug trade, but without the legal implications. The immense appetite of China and other Asian societies for exotic animals has promoted exponential growth in trade and profits. Wild and domestic animals sold in “wet markets” are kept in unsanitary and unethical conditions. There, feces, urine and food waste from cages at the top spill into cages at the bottom, creating the perfect conditions for viruses to leap from wild animals to domestic animals and humans. Thousands of wildlife species or their products are traded annually.

Wildlife trade is one of several human impacts, including habitat loss and fragmentation, pollution, toxification and invasive species, that have caused the extinction of thousands of species and threaten many more. Indeed, most people are unaware that the current extinction crisis is unprecedented in human history. Extinction occurs when the last individual of a species dies. The UN recently estimated that one million species, such as the panda, the orangutan and the Sumatran rhino, are at risk of extinction.

The second finding is that population extinctions, which are the prelude to species extinctions, are occurring at very fast rates (Ceballos et al., 2017). Around 32 percent of a sample of 27,000 species have declining populations and have experienced massive geographic range contractions. Population extinctions are a very severe and widespread environmental problem which we have called “Biological Annihilation”.

Finally, our third finding indicates that the magnitude of the extinction crisis is underestimated because there are thousands of species on the brink of extinction (Ceballos et al., 2020). Those species will likely become extinct in the near future unless a massive conservation effort is launched soon.

Many times, people have asked me why we should care about the loss of a species. There are ethical, moral, philosophical, religious and other reasons to be concerned. But perhaps the one that is most tangible for most people is the loss of ecosystem services, which are the benefits that humans derive from the proper function of nature. Ecosystem services include the proper mix of gases in the atmosphere that support life on Earth, the quantity and quality of water, pollination of wild crops and plants, fertilization of the soil, and protection against emerging pests and diseases, among many others. Every time a species is lost, ecosystem services are likely to erode and human well-being is reduced.

The loss of so many ecosystems and species is pushing us towards the point of collapse of civilization. The good news is that there is still time to reduce the current extinction crisis. The species and ecosystems that we manage to save in the next 10 – 15 years will define the future of biodiversity and civilization. What it is at stake is the future of mankind.

### 2

#### 1] Extinction comes first!

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

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

#### 2] Biological death is the worst evil – it’s not white paranoia

Paterson 03 – Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island. (Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics, <http://sce.sagepub.com>)

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81 In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

#### 3] Probability should be contextualized in magnitude and timeframe – otherwise, our actions would always be the safest bet

#### 4] Ballot shouldn’t be viewed as a referendum on mitigating oppression given the nature of debate – there has to be a loser, and in that case you would be saying one debater isn’t doing it good enough, which is incredibly violent

#### 5] Racism being bad doesn’t answer the question of why it’s bad – conceptions of pain

### 3

#### Text:

#### 1. The World Trade Organization ought to be abolished.

#### 2. The following 164 countries listed in the speech doc ought to independently and without influence from international government [opponent’s plan]

Afghanistan

Albania

Angola

Antigua and Barbuda

Argentina

Armenia

Australia

Austria

Bahrain, Kingdom of

Bangladesh

Barbados

Belgium

Belize

Benin

Bolivia, Plurinational State of

Botswana

Brazil

Brunei Darussalam

Bulgaria

Burkina Faso

Burundi

Cabo Verde

Cambodia

Cameroon

Canada

Central African Republic

Chad

Chile

China

Colombia

Congo

Costa Rica

Côte d’Ivoire

Croatia

Cuba

Cyprus

Czech Republic

Democratic Republic of the Congo

Denmark

Djibouti

Dominica

Dominican Republic

Ecuador

Egypt

El Salvador

Estonia

Eswatini

European Union (formerly EC)

Fiji

Finland

France

Gabon

Gambia

Georgia

Germany

Ghana

Greece

Grenada

Guatemala

Guinea

Guinea-Bissau

Guyana

Haiti

Honduras

Hong Kong, China

Hungary

Iceland

India

Indonesia

Ireland

Israel

Italy

Jamaica

Japan

Jordan

Kazakhstan

Kenya

Korea, Republic of

Kuwait, the State of

Kyrgyz Republic

Lao People’s Democratic Republic

Latvia

Lesotho

Liberia

Liechtenstein

Lithuania

Luxembourg

Macao, China

Madagascar

Malawi

Malaysia

Maldives

Mali

Malta

Mauritania

Mauritius

Mexico

Moldova, Republic of

Mongolia

Montenegro

Morocco

Mozambique

Myanmar

Namibia

Nepal

Netherlands

New Zealand

Nicaragua

Niger

Nigeria

North Macedonia

Norway

Oman

Pakistan

Panama

Papua New Guinea

Paraguay

Peru

Philippines

Poland

Portugal

Qatar

Romania

Russian Federation

Rwanda

Saint Kitts and Nevis

Saint Lucia

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

Samoa

Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of

Senegal

Seychelles

Sierra Leone

Singapore

Slovak Republic

Slovenia

Solomon Islands

South Africa

Spain

Sri Lanka

Suriname

Sweden

Switzerland

Chinese Taipei

Tajikistan

Tanzania

Thailand

Togo

Tonga

Trinidad and Tobago

Tunisia

Turkey

Uganda

Ukraine

United Arab Emirates

United Kingdom

United States

Uruguay

Vanuatu

Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of

Viet Nam

Yemen

Zambia

Zimbabwe

Hawley, senator, JD Yale, 20

(Josh, 5-5, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/05/opinion/hawley-abolish-wto-china.html)

The coronavirus emergency is not only a public health crisis. With [30 million Americans unemployed](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/04/30/us-weekly-jobless-claims.html), it is also an economic crisis. And it has exposed a hard truth about the modern global economy: it weakens American workers and has empowered China’s rise. That must change. The global economic system as we know it is a relic; it requires reform, top to bottom. We should begin with one of its leading institutions, the World Trade Organization. We should abolish it.

#### The WTO as an institution is unethical and perpetuates colonialism

Godrej 20

(Dinyar, Co-editor @ New Internationalist, 4-20, https://newint.org/features/2020/02/10/brief-history-impoverishment)

For countries that were undergoing economic ravishment by structural adjustment, the 1990s brought new torments in the form of the World Trade Organization (WTO), a club dominated by rich nations. In the name of creating a ‘level playing field’, the WTO required poorer countries to sign up to an all-or-nothing, binding set of rules, which removed protections for domestic industries and allowed foreign capital unhindered access. This was strongly prejudicial to the interests of local industries, which were not in a position to withstand foreign competition. Influence within the WTO is weighted by the size of a nation’s economy – thus even if all poorer nations joined forces to demand policy changes they would still not have a chance against wealthy nations. This trade injustice has drawn widespread protests and pressure for the WTO to reform. Meanwhile, wealthy nations are increasingly going down the route of bilateral Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). Usually negotiated in secret, the interests of their corporations are paramount in FTAs and include the ability to sue states for eye-watering sums (should they, for example, want to terminate a contract or nationalize an industry) with no provision for states to do the same. Such instruments are working to create a utopia for transnational corporations, creating a business-friendly climate, which translates as the demolition of labour protection, tax cuts for the wealthiest and a supine regulatory environment. Tax havens operated by the richest countries are home to huge sums of illicit wealth draining out of some of the poorest. Today, due to how the global economy has been engineered, for every dollar of aid sent to poorer countries, they lose 10 times as much in outflows – and that’s before one counts their losses through unfair trade rules and underpaid labour. Foreign investors take nearly $500 billion a year in profits from the Global South, and trade-power imbalances cost poorer nations $700 billion a year in lost export revenue. 7 CONCENTRATION In the 21st century wealth increasingly flows through corporate hands towards a small super-elite. In a trend that began in the 1990s, the lion’s share of equity value is being realized through squeezing workers: the classification ‘working poor’ so familiar in the Global South is now increasingly also being used in the wealthy North, where neoliberal capitalism is leading inevitably to wage erosion and work precarity, coupled with the withdrawal of state support. Inequality is rising dramatically. In 2018 the richest 26 people owned wealth equivalent to the poorest half of the world’s population. And their wealth was increasing at the rate of $2.5 billion a day. Meanwhile 3.4 billion people – nearly half the world – were living on less than $5.50 a day.

### 4

#### Interp- The 1AC must advocate for the immediate reduction intellectual property protections

#### Violation:

#### “I affirm rhetorical decolonization to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines in the member nations of the World Trade Organization.”

#### Proves the aff requires rhetorical decol before the plan can happen – at best, they’re effects-t and at worst it’s a solvency deficit to case.

#### Standards:

#### 1~ Limits—They can push the actual elimination of LAWs into the future indefinitely and allows for thousands of new affs that gradually change when the ban happens and kill neg ground since we can’t access things like delay CPs which kills education.

#### 2~ Inherency—Neg DAs are based on squo defense. Affs that codify the squo have zero ground as there can be no UQ for the claims.

#### Fairness is an impact – [1] it’s an intrinsic good – some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the [2] probability – your ballot can’t solve their impacts but it can solve mine – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but can rectify abuse in round [3] comes before substance – deciding any other argument in this debate cannot be disentangled from our inability to prepare for it – any argument you think they’re winning is a link, not a reason to vote for them,

### Case

#### 1] Framework—Interpretation: They have to prove the desirability of the causal consequences of the plan., Fairness—Arbitrary frameworks moot the 1AC—there are infinite parts of the 1AC they could problematize forcing 1AR restart. Our scholarship is tied to the consequences of the plan so it makes no sense to separate assumptions from implementation.

#### Reject performative offense – it is predicated on not endorsing the resolution, so if they endorse the rez, they can’t get access to any of this making debate better stuff

#### The affirmative is a drop in the bucket – racial cap is prevalent through the rest of our worlds – there’s no reason that IP protections are the lynchpin of removing racial biases in the world. That means you should probably give less priority to their impx if we prove real impx that kill people

#### The first Vats card – it doesn’t create a correlation between race and patents – it’s statistics 101 they need correlation to justify causation – they shouldn’t get access to this impact

#### The second Vats card just outlines problems with the WTO and the way TRIPS is written – the plan doesn’t do anything about this since they aren’t advocating for changing TRIPS or removing the WTO – only the CP does this, which means the CP solves even better than the aff

#### The third Vats card makes a lot of empirical claims without empirical warrants – you should be skeptical of all of these args

#### The sixth Vats card says “We cannot be satisfied with the recognition” but the ballot is a politics of recognition- vote neg in order to spread the message of vote aff – they’ve double turned themselves. If you buy any little part of the aff, you should still vote neg bc otherwise you’re buying into the politics of rejection that the aff rejects.

#### Their totalizing depiction of racial capitalism as requiring suicide produces a heroic drive for total revolution that obscures “as existing” progress

Shulman, PhD, 17

(George, PoliSci@NYU, Critical Exchange Afro pessimism, Contemporary political theory)

For on the one hand, it seems to me that ‘‘social death’’ is totalized as the truth that must be faced without consolation, while on the other hand, the only valid response is depicted as revolutionary (perhaps violent) refusal. We are driven toward helplessness and despair by an annihilating structure that seems impossible to change, but also, if we ask, what can be done, we receive images of revolutionary suicide. The systematic character of critique offers a clarity that is appealing; we also may be tempted by the appearance of heroic radicalism – and by an unavowed solace we may derive from the form of ‘‘election’’ it offers. But we may be better served by questioning the either-or structure of exceptionality, which juxtaposes social death in/as the ordinary to metaphors of radical refusal. By that structure, Schmitt distinguished ordinary existence as deadening repetition, and miracle as the decision to take exception to it; for Wilderson and Sexton ‘‘life’’ thus seems to require the decisive, unequivocal ‘‘event’’ of overcoming an ordinary life ruled – indeed emptied out, negated, or literally killed – by inescapably gripping social death. But what kind of life or politics is this? Might the ‘‘fact’’ or ‘‘lived experience’’ of blackness as social death be metabolized, transfigured, resisted, or dramatized in other ways? Rather than radically juxtapose awful truth and demeaned consolation, could we rework the relationship of critique and repair? Or is the impossibility of repair in its usual senses – because only a revolution would be truly reparative – the necessary assumption for rightly seeing the conditions of black agency? Rather than respond to their critique by asking, what radical action could possibly suffice to change this world, could we ask instead, what is already being done?

#### Collapse makes their impacts worse

**Korowicz 14**—former ministerial appointment to the council of Comhar, director of Metis Risk, on the executive committee of Feasta, The Foundation for the Economics of Sustainability

(David, “How to be Trapped: An Interview with David Korowicz”, <http://www.resilience.org/stories/2014-03-19/how-to-be-trapped-an-interview-with-david-korowicz>, dml)

That said, a disorderly de-growth/collapse would bring us to a new era where we would end up with a much reduced capacity to access and use resources and dump waste. But we’d still have to respond to problems and that would generally require whatever energy and resources were at hand. For example, anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions would likely nose-dive, a good thing of course, although the effects of climate changes would continue to get worse because of lags in the climate system while our adaptive capacity compared to today would have been shattered. Thus the real cost of climate change would escalate beyond our ability to pay quite suddenly and much faster than conventional climate-economic models would suggest. The danger here is that in a state of poverty and forced localization our attempts to respond to such emergent stress and crises mean we start undermining our local environments and their on-going capacity to support us. So any form of steady-state economy in the foreseeable future is inherently problematic.

### 5

#### Counterplan text: [Countries] should establish a government-financed Pharmaceutical Innovation Fund, which will financially reward companies for therapeutic drugs, cost-reducing innovations, and reward those who prove patents to be invalid.

#### That incentivizes better therapeutic drugs and boosts innovation

Hollis 04

Aidan Hollis [Dr. Aidan Hollis is Professor in Economics at the University of Calgary, and President of Incentives for Global Health, a US-based NGO focused on the development of the Health Impact Fund proposal], 10 June 2004, “An Efficient Reward System for Pharmaceutical Innovation”, [https://www.who.int/intellectualproperty/news/Submission-Hollis6-Oct.pdf //](https://www.who.int/intellectualproperty/news/Submission-Hollis6-Oct.pdf%20//) AK

This section describes a method for rewarding patented pharmaceuticals with payments or rewards paid out of a government-financed Pharmaceutical Innovation Fund (PIF). When a drug is approved for use in a country, it would be registered by a firm, normally by the owner of related patents required in the production of the drug.18 The PIF would make payments to registrants, and in exchange for such payments, registrants would be compelled to grant zero-priced licenses for all listed patents when used to make and sell the drug. The payments would be annual during the period in which the registrant’s drugs were patented. Rewards would also be paid for patented cost-reducing process innovations, for exceptional discoveries not protected by patents, and for court verdicts of invalidity or non-infringement which allowed for generic production without a compulsory license. The purpose of this section is to outline how the fund should determine the reward for a given innovation. Payments from the PIF would be made based on the proportion of points attributable, according to the following categories: (1) Drugs which advance health should be given points reflecting the gain in average therapeutic value less costs of treatment over that of the next best pre-existing treatment, for all units of the drug sold by the registrant and by other manufacturers in a given year. Therapeutic value is determined by multiplying the incremental QALYs of the treatment by the dollar value of a QALY.19 (In determining the next best treatment, the PIF should exclude patented medicines registered by the same firm and medicines relying on the same patented innovations as the medicine under consideration.) In other words, the PIF agency will determine the net benefit of a drug, and then compare it to the net benefit of the next most effective pre-existing therapy, and award points based on the improvement. These points would be awarded to the registrant for each year in which the registrant’s patents would, in the absence of compulsory licensing, be sufficient to prevent other firms from producing bio-equivalent products. Evaluation would be undertaken annually, based on the available information about a drug.20 See the appendix (S. 8) for more details on quantifying this amount. (2) Cost-reducing innovations should be granted points equal to the price reductions enabled by implementation of the patented innovation. Specifically, points allocated for cost-reducing innovations should be equal to the difference between the average price of the medicine set by all sellers using the patented innovation and the average price of those not using the innovation, times the number of pills in which the innovation was implemented. See the appendix for more details on quantifying this amount. (3) A person who was able to show in court the invalidity of all remaining patents on a drug should be rewarded with a share (say 10%) of the previous year’s reward for that drug. Payment of monetary awards would be according to the following ordering. First, the PIF would pay out any awards under (3). Each registrant (for type (1)) or patentee of a cost- saving process (for type (2)) would obtain a payment equal to the total remaining monetary reward multiplied by its share of the total points allocated under (1) and (2). 21

#### Drug prices will drop significantly

Hollis 04

Aidan Hollis [Dr. Aidan Hollis is Professor in Economics at the University of Calgary, and President of Incentives for Global Health, a US-based NGO focused on the development of the Health Impact Fund proposal], 10 June 2004, “An Efficient Reward System for Pharmaceutical Innovation”, [https://www.who.int/intellectualproperty/news/Submission-Hollis6-Oct.pdf //](https://www.who.int/intellectualproperty/news/Submission-Hollis6-Oct.pdf%20//) AK

Prices of medicines under this proposal would fall to approximately the average cost of production. Based on experience with drugs facing generic competition today, this implies that patented drug prices would decrease by on average 50% to 80%. This would obviously be beneficial for consumers and insurers, with total savings in the US of on the order of $100bn annually. Globally, savings might be on the order of $200bn.25 Aside from the reduction in total expense to consumers, there would be a welfare gain from increased consumption of lower-priced medicines. The deadweight loss (DWL) from the current patent system is certainly immense in pharmaceutical markets. The gains from pricing drugs at approximately the average cost of production could easily be valued at $100bn, and gains in terms of saved lives would likely be very large.

#### Perm fails – complete replacement of the patent system is fiscally impossible and drives down innovation

Stevens & Ezell 20

Philip Stevens, Stephen Ezell [His main research interests are the intersection of intellectual property, trade, and health policy. Formerly he was an official at the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) in Geneva, where he worked in its Global Challenges Division on a range of IP and health issues. Prior to his time with WIPO, Philip worked as director of policy for International Policy Network, a UK-based think tank, as well as holding research positions with the Adam Smith Institute and Reform, both in London.], 3 February 2020, “Delinkage Debunked: Why Replacing Patents With Prizes for Drug Development Won’t Work”, [https://itif.org/publications/2020/02/03/delinkage-debunked-why-replacing-patents-prizes-drug-development-wont-work //](https://itif.org/publications/2020/02/03/delinkage-debunked-why-replacing-patents-prizes-drug-development-wont-work%20//) AK

Governments worldwide would need to come up with nearly $200 billion a year to comprehensively replace the current market- and patent-based system with a prize system. As noted, in America, U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders’s plan calls for an $80-billion-a-year prize fund. As Dean Baker has written, “The [U.S.] government already spends more than $30 billion a year to finance biomedical research through the National Institutes of Health. It would probably be necessary to increase this amount by $50–$60 billion a year in order to replace the funding currently supported through patent monopolies.”11 In fact, drug companies invest in excess of $180 billion per year in R&D related to drug development.12 But even accepting Baker’s lower number, in a political and fiscal environment wherein the U.S. Congress cannot even index the gas tax to inflation to pay for badly needed roads and bridges (even with gas prices close to their lowest levels in nearly a generation), the chances Congress would be willing to appropriate the funds needed for any of these proposals is close to zero.13 In fact, the U.S. Congress’s modus operandi is to enact policies to shift public-sector costs to the private sector through mandates, not to take away private-sector costs with public-sector spending. And with government balance sheets tight everywhere (government debt as a share of GDP in Europe reached an all-time high in the mid-2010s, for instance), it is equally unlikely governments in other countries would be willing to allocate the sums needed. Given the general unwillingness of the public or lawmakers to support higher taxes or spending (in the United States or elsewhere), such proposals to replace private revenue with government spending would almost certainly lead to reduced overall investment (combined private and public) in biomedical innovation. Moreover, if the United States did not step up to the plate, the effort would be stillborn from the start. That is because the United States currently accounts for just under half of global biomedical R&D investment.14 And even that figure belies how significant U.S. contributions have been to biomedical R&D in recent years, with one study finding that the United States has been the world’s largest global funder of biomedical R&D investment over the past two decades, with a share some analyses suggest reached as high as 70 to 80 percent over that time period.15 A prize-based system would largely replace U.S. private capital with U.S. taxpayers as the leading funder of global biomedical innovation, and make the resulting IP and innovation a freely available global public good—a key reason why so many developing countries favor the scheme. Indeed, in a prize system, innovators would hold few cards. Their R&D costs would already be sunk at the time of prize disbursement, and to qualify for the prize, details of the invention would have to be disclosed to the government (or an international agency) at a level of detail far beyond that currently required by the patent system. Thus, the main advantage of a delinkage system for countries such as China—which as part of its “Made in China 2025” plan has targeted building the largest generic drug industry in the world—would be to obtain free IP for its budding industry, the lion’s share of which would be funded by prizes paid for by taxpayers from developed nations.16 In other words, what delinkage proponents really want is for taxpayers in developed countries (principally the United States) to finance the bulk of global biomedical research and innovation, which would then become freely available for generic drug manufacturers to immediately copy at marginal cost and then export back to the countries paying the most for the prizes. As such, a prize model would almost surely mean large trade deficits in biopharmaceutical products for developed nations. Delinkage would further advance proponents’ fundamental goal of undermining a global IP system they abhor, as reflected in reports such as Dean Baker’s “Is Intellectual Property the Root of All Evil? Patents, Copyrights, and Inequality.”17 Or, as Baker wrote with Joseph Stiglitz and Arjun Jayadev in a Project Syndicate article, “The IP standards advanced countries favor typically are designed not to maximize innovation and scientific progress, but to maximize the profits of big pharmaceutical companies and others able to sway trade negotiations.”18 In this way, delinkage isn’t much different from the compulsory licensing policies they’ve advocated for several middle-income countries—including Brazil, Colombia, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand—to issue on patents for innovative medicines over the past 20 years. Whether through delinkage or compulsory licenses, advocates want to weaken global IP rights, and force divulgence of IP at prices that would usually be far below market (if not outright free). But returning to the underlying underinvestment and free-riding challenge; this challenge isn’t just theoretical, it’s already a reality. That’s because a drug development system in which prizes replaced intellectual property would have very limited impact if only one country chose to adopt it. Companies would be discouraged from applying for prizes in that country because unless the award were large enough to cover what otherwise would have been their global revenues from development of a patent-protected drug, they would not apply. Instead, they would focus their efforts elsewhere on countries that retained robust standards of IP protection.