# 1NC 5-off

## 1NC – T Medicines

#### Interpretation: The aff must defend that member nations reduce intellectual property protections for all medicines

#### Violation: They specify medicines as COVID Vaccines

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

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

1. Generics and Logical Form

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

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

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

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

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

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

#### It applies to “Medicines” – adding “generally” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning because the res never specified further

#### Vote negative:

#### 1] Precision – they justify arbitrarily mooting words in the resolution at their own whim in order to justify some potentially good interp.

#### Semantics outweighs:

#### [a] Lexical priority – it doesn’t matter if their interp if the debate is not pertinent i.e. it might me more educational for me to study for AP physics, outweighs since the topic constrains what pragmatics are relevant.

#### 2] Limits and ground – their model allows affs to defend any medicine which explodes neg prep bc theres an infinite amount I can’t prepare for, like covid-19 vaccines, influenza, common colds, Marijuana, etc. and they all bracket out different DA’s

#### 3] TVA: Read a whole res aff with the same advantage

#### Voters

#### Fairness because its constitutive of debate

#### DTD – a) norms b) prevents abuse

#### CI- a) judge intervention b) arbitrary brightline

#### No RVI- a) time skew b) chilling effect

#### No 1AR theory- creates 7-6 time skew

### T-REDUCE

#### Interpretation: “reduce” indicates permanency. The aff may not defend suspensions on intellectual property rights

#### Reduce indicates permanency – it’s distinct from “suspend” Prefer our evidence – legal and should o/w all other definitions. This is the only legal interpretation of reduce in the court system which means that it applies to all legal implementations of the plan

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.

#### Violation –they violate because COVID-19 patent waivers are temporary – hold the line – don’t let them shift out by saying that they defend permanency, they should’ve specced that in the 1ac and their advantages say nothing about the permanent benefits of having waivers

#### Melimopoulos, 21 (Elizabeth Melimopoulos, 6-29-2021, accessed on 8-15-2021, Al Jazeera, "Explainer: What are patent waivers for COVID vaccines?", https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/6/29/explainer-what-are-covid-vaccine-patent-waivers)

What does an IP waiver do? A waiver temporarily “removes” the intellectual protections provided by the WTO

#### Vote neg –

#### 1 – Limits – they can cherrypick from multiple timeframes which means that a) they shift out of multiple DAs by saying the patents will be gone by then which moots neg offence and b) non-permanency kills NCs and Ks because they can just delink in the 1ar and forces us to start over c) this links to fairness and ed because we can’t have proper educative clash and they moot offence

#### 2 – Predictability – Not following the resolution legally allows them to come up with whatever plan they want and a) that destroys our ability to predict because they can just go with something random and there is no way we can prep for that before the first tourney on the topic

#### Extend Paradigm Issues from First T Shell

### 1NC – CP

#### CP Text: Vaccine developers should enter into binding contractual agreements with generic producers to ensure the quality of generic products and establish royalty rates on generic sales. The member nations of the WTO should publicly declare their support of legitimate compulsory licensees in the cases where voluntary requests have been ignored.

Silverman 3/15 [Rachel Silverman is a policy fellow at the Center for Global Development where she leads policy-oriented research on global health financing and incentive structures. Silverman’s current research focuses on the practical application of results-based financing; global health transitions; efficient global health procurement; innovation models for global health; priority-setting for UHC; alignment and impact in international funding for family planning; and strategies to strengthen evidence and accountability. BA with distinction in international relations and economics from Stanford University.) “Waiving vaccine patents won’t help inoculate poorer nations” Washington Post, PostEverything Perspective, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/03/15/vaccine-coronavirus-patents-waive-global-equity/>] RM

There are better options than broadly waiving IP rules — notably, encouraging (and pressuring) vaccine manufacturers to cooperate and share knowledge with partners across the globe. Voluntary licensing is one route: It’s a common arrangement in which developers enter into binding contractual agreements with generic producers. Generic manufacturers get permission, know-how and assistance from the patent-holder to produce the vaccine for sales in specified markets; in exchange, the patent-holder can ensure quality of the generic product and may receive royalties on its sales, usually representing less than 10 percent of sales value.

These royalties may be lower than the profit margin on direct sales; for example, Pfizer expects a 25 to 30 percent profit on its vaccine sales, or roughly $5 for every $19.50 dose. (The U.S. government has agreed to buy 300 million doses at that price.) But voluntary licensing deals offer a new revenue stream that would otherwise be captured by competitors — not to mention good publicity. Already, **voluntary licensing deals from AstraZeneca and Novavax are facilitating large-scale production in India, Japan and South Korea**; many of the resulting vaccines are destined for lower-income countries through Covax.

The best route to vaccine equity involves creating the conditions to facilitate more of these voluntary deals.

How can governments and activists help push things in the right direction? By lifting the export curbs on materials such as filters and bioreactor bags intended to protect domestic supply, countries can help lubricate supply chains, creating a better environment for cross-national collaboration. Governments and development-finance institutions can invest to build up the capabilities of potential vaccine manufacturing plants, making it easier for originators to say yes. Domestically, the Biden administration did something like this when it [invested](https://www.merck.com/news/merck-to-help-produce-johnson-barda-to-provide-merck-with-funding-to-expand-mercks-manufacturing-capacity-for-covid-19-vaccines-and-medicines/) $269 million under the Defense Production Act to prepare Merck’s manufacturing facilities to produce the Johnson & Johnson vaccine — a crucial plank of the [joint production deal](https://www.hhs.gov/about/news/2021/03/02/biden-administration-announces-historic-manufacturing-collaboration-between-merck-johnson-johnson-expand-production-covid-19-vaccines.html) announced this month. Similar efforts are underway abroad. On March 12, for example, the “Quad” — the United States, India, Japan and Australia — [announced](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-asia/u-s-india-japan-and-australia-counter-china-with-billion-dose-vaccine-pact-idUSKBN2B40IP) a joint pledge to produce and disseminate 1 billion vaccine doses; as part of this effort, the Biden administration [announced](https://in.usembassy.gov/dfc-announces-support-for-manufacturing-of-vaccines-during-quad-summit/) that it would help finance an Indian generic manufacturer to make coronavirus vaccines, including the Johnson & Johnson product. The contractual language of licensing deals can explicitly protect IP from broader dissemination, helping originators feel more comfortable sharing commercially valuable information.

Sticks as well as carrots can facilitate partnerships. Under [existing World Trade Organization rules](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/trips_e/public_health_faq_e.htm), countries already have the right to issue “compulsory licenses” in certain cases pertaining to public health, allowing them to produce or import generic health products without permission from the patent-holder. Advocates correctly point out that countries face potential retaliation from industry and wealthy governments when they try to use these tools — a strong disincentive. (In 2006-2007, Thailand’s use of compulsory licenses to access more affordable AIDS drugs led the United States to revoke preferential trade status for some Thai exports.) This should change. The Biden administration and other global leaders should make clear that they will support legitimate compulsory licensees of coronavirus vaccines in cases where a valid voluntary license request has been rejected or ignored.

**But compulsory licensing is vastly inferior to voluntary deals in the case of vaccines, because with the former the generic producer would still need to figure out how to make the vaccines without the originator’s assistance — again, an extraordinarily difficult task.** It is useful mainly as a threat held in reserve, paired with the “carrots” of subsidies to local plants and so on. **Firms may choose to play ball on voluntary licensing deals rather than face a mess of legal challenges and bad publicity.** This month, for example, Canadian biotech firm Biolyse Pharma publicly requested a voluntary license to manufacture the Johnson & Johnson vaccine for global distribution. If Johnson & Johnson is unwilling, Biolyse made clear in its announcement, the company will appeal to the Canadian government for a compulsory license. The ball is now in Johnson & Johnson’s court — but this seems like the type of offer it should choose to accept, **both for the global good and its self-interest**.

Scaling up vaccine production is an imperative for equitable global access and an end to the pandemic**. But it is smart incentives for sharing knowledge, not the wholesale elimination of intellectual-property rights, that will get us to the finish line.**

### 1NC – DA

#### Biotech R&D is set for high growth and investment now

NASDAQ 8/9 [NASDAQ is a stock market index that includes almost all stocks listed on the Nasdaq stock exchange. Along with the Dow Jones Industrial Average and S&P 500, it is one of the three most-followed stock market indices in the United States. This article was written by NASDAQ contributors and published on CNBC. The editorial staff of CNBC did not contribute to the creation of this study.) “Why the Nasdaq Biotechnology Index is poised for a run of sustainable growth” CNBC, NASDAQ, 8/9/2021, <https://www.cnbc.com/advertorial/2021/08/09/why-the-nasdaq-biotechnology-index-is-poised-for-a-run-of-sustainable-growth-.html>] RM

Between the recent bio innovation success stories in the battle against Covid-19 and the technology-driven advances ushering in new efficiencies for research and development (R&D), **the biotech industry has never been more relevant**.

As home to more than 265 companies, the pioneering Nasdaq Biotechnology Index (NBI) has long been committed to providing healthcare’s innovators with access to the capital they need to keep moving forward. Now, investors have access to the Index’s companies through a new ETF, the Invesco Nasdaq Biotechnology ETF (IBBQ).

Launched in 1993, in the wake of the original “biotech revolution” led by the discovery of recombinant DNA, NBI® remains the most representative index in the space. In fact, 98% of all U.S. listed biotech companies are listed on Nasdaq. When considering the massive growth taking place in the sector, it’s no surprise that NBI has outperformed both the S&P 500 (SPX) and Health Care Select Sector Index (IXVTR) in certain market environments.

According to Mark Marex, Index R&D Senior Specialist for Nasdaq who recently compiled an in-depth report on the NBI, global events and digital acceleration have contributed to the Index’s recent strong performance; and Nasdaq’s dedication to maintaining a true benchmark for technology-driven healthcare innovation has provided a framework for growth.

Building the ideal benchmark

Given the existence of pureplay biotech firms, hybrid biopharmaceutical companies, and less R&D-intensive pharmaceutical manufacturers, creating a single benchmark that truly captures the biotech sector and the symbiotic relationships among its players is no easy task.

One of the unique aspects of NBI, versus biotech-focused indexes created by other index providers, is its subsector classifications split between Biotechnology and Pharmaceuticals. As of June 30, 2021, ICB (FTSE Russell’s Industry Classification Benchmark) classified 222 NBI companies as Biotechnology and 47 as Pharmaceuticals. The resulting split by index weight is approximately 65% and 35%, respectively, which illustrates the major difference between the two groups: Pharmaceutical companies tend to be much larger than Biotechnology firms.

This split within a single index provides advantages for investors: While offering some exposure to more established pharmaceutical companies, it also includes R&D-heavy biotech firms that over time may transition into biotech-driven pharma companies. That’s exactly what happened this year when NBI’s largest company, Amgen (AMGN / $144Bn), was reclassified by ICB from Biotechnology to Pharmaceuticals. By retaining firms as they straddle the two classifications over the course of their lifecycle, NBI presents potential growth advantages when compared with index providers that focus rigidly on one classification versus the other.

Home to world-changing breakthroughs

Nasdaq’s vision for the Index has served it well, **both in terms of its longevity and its current role as a champion of the companies paving the way for a post-pandemic world through their technological advances and life-saving treatments**. The broad reach of NBI constituents across multiple fronts in the fight against Covid-19, for example — from diagnosis to vaccines and treatment —demonstrates the strength of its core approach.

NBI companies including Gilead and Regeneron made headlines for their successes during the pandemic with antiviral therapeutics and antibody-based therapeutics for high-risk patients. But it’s the stunning success of m-RNA vaccine technology from Moderna and BioNTech, two NBI companies, that most clearly showcase the home run potential among the biotech entrepreneurs in the space.

And while NBI is currently up 8.2% YTD on a price-return basis (as of June 30) **versus a broader market gain of 14.4% by SPX**, the S&P Biotechnology Select Industry Index (SPSIBI) is down 3.7%.

It’s worth noting that in 2020, NBI outperformed SPX with a price gain of 25.7% versus 16.3%, respectively. This shows the resilience of the NBI and the inherent strength of its current mix of companies.

The possibilities of accelerated R&D

As a whole, the life-changing work being done by NBI constituents requires enormous amounts of R&D. In 2020, R&D expenses for the entire group totaled $68.5Bn, nearly 31% of these companies’ revenue totals. Two-thirds of NBI’s firms reported R&D expenses that exceeded their revenues

For several NBI companies, however, these massive investments provided tangible benefits in the fight against Covid-19. Undoubtedly, years of back-end work and minimal profits ultimately helped deliver the very products that are now driving historic returns. Psychologically, their breakthroughs demonstrated the enormous potential of science and technology to serve humankind.

Looking ahead, **revolutions in Mapping and Engineering processes, boosted by rapid advancements in Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence, are fostering a true fusion of Biology and Technology that could transform the traditionally costly and labor-intensive R&D function**. Some research estimates these advances could reduce the failure rate of drugs by up to 45% and shorten drug trials by up to 50%. The result could be even more breakthroughs, performed much more efficiently, greatly increasing the returns on biopharmaceutical R&D.

Even a conservative interpretation of the above numbers would significantly reduce R&D costs and boost the market capitalization of therapeutics companies from the current $2Tn up to $9Tn as soon as 2024, according to estimates from ARK Financial.

Meanwhile, increasingly cost-effective human genomics could revolutionize several other industries, from agriculture to biofuels.

By any measure, there is much to be excited about across the spectrum of biotech — especially coming out of a global pandemic. And while no person, nor index, can truly predict what the future holds, chances are strong that companies sitting within NBI will have a hand in leading the way.

“**For investors**, the Index already serves as a fascinating lens through which to view human society’s scientific and technological advancements,” says Mark Marex. “To me, it’s very exciting to ponder what the researchers, scientists, and business leaders in this space will accomplish next.”

#### IPR protections are key to sustain healthcare investments and manufacturing. Independently, it’s key to broader vaccine production.

Roberts 6/25/21 [James M. Roberts is a Research Fellow for Economic Freedom and Growth at the Heritage Foundation. Roberts' primary responsibility as one of The Heritage Foundation's lead experts in economic freedom and growth is to edit the Rule of Law and Monetary Freedom sections of [Index of Economic Freedom](https://www.heritage.org/index/). An influential annual analysis of the economic climate of countries throughout the world, the Index is co-published by Heritage and The Wall Street Journal.) “Biden’s OK of Global Theft of America’s Intellectual Property is Wrong, Dangerous.” 6/25/2021, The Heritage Foundation, Commentary—Public Health] RM

Last month, President Biden advocated removing international intellectual property rights (IPR) protections for American-made COVID-19 vaccines.

**Foreign companies may take the president’s policy as a green light to produce reverse-engineered, counterfeit substitutes**.

The best way to prevent and treat new diseases is to ensure that private American pharmaceutical companies continue their innovative research and vaccine production.

Three U.S. companies—Pfizer, Moderna, and Johnson & Johnson—created and manufactured the world’s most effective mRNA COVID vaccines in record time. An increasing majority of Americans have now been inoculated, but much of the developing world remains in desperate need of vaccines. Americans naturally want to help. The question is how.

Last month, President Biden advocated removing international intellectual property rights (IPR) protections for American-made COVID-19 vaccines. This, he said, would help make the vaccines more plentiful and available in needy countries. **It’s a short-sighted approach and doomed to fail.**

Mr. Biden wants to waive the World Trade Organization’s “Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights” (TRIPS) agreement for U.S. vaccines and let foreign countries issue “compulsory licenses“ allowing their domestic pharmaceutical companies to manufacture the medicines without adequately compensating the companies that invented them.

Practically speaking, countries such as India and South Africa are unlikely to manufacture the vaccines. They lack an advanced infrastructure for cold supply-chain distribution and many other crucial resources required by these products’ capital-intensive, state-of-the-art manufacturing process.

But the Biden policy is bad for many other reasons.

Developing breakthrough medications takes tremendous ingenuity and immense financial investments. **It’s an extraordinarily high-risk endeavor, and the prospect of making a profit is what convinces private companies to undertake those risks.**

Signaling that the United States will not fight to defend their intellectual property rights **actively undermines innovation and manufacturing** in American health care and medicines.

It also erodes patient protections by undermining quality control. Foreign companies may take the president’s policy as a green light to produce reverse-engineered, counterfeit substitutes. Already there are reports of ineffective and even dangerous counterfeit COVID-19 vaccines being sold around the world.

Those pushing to break U.S. pharmaceutical patents say they want to do so for altruistic reasons. Consequently, they also insist that the prices for the medications be set far below their actual value.

But history shows us that forcing private companies to provide vaccines at an “affordable price,” regardless of the cost to the companies, actually impedes the manufacture of high-quality vaccines. Moreover, it inhibits the **future development of vaccines** needed to meet as-yet-unknown diseases.

Washington first imposed vaccine price controls as part of Hillary Clinton’s 1993 healthcare-for-all crusade. As the Wall Street Journal later noted, it was a body blow to the U.S. vaccine industry. Ironically, government-decreed prices left the companies unable to produce enough vaccines to meet Mrs. Clinton’s admittedly admirable goal of universal immunization of children. Since then, U.S. firms have largely eschewed the vaccine market because they could not recoup their R&D and manufacturing costs and earn enough profit to fund future innovation.

Ultimately, **compulsory licensing legalizes the theft of intellectual property**. Recognizing this, senators from both sides of the aisle have joined with other government officials and industry leaders to call on the administration to reverse this bad decision.

The U.S. patent protection system has served the nation well since its founding.  **It is and has been a bulwark of American prosperity**, but the strength of that protection has been weakening in the past few decades. **Compulsory licensing contributes to the erosion** of that protection.

As the U.S. and the rest of the world emerge from the pandemic, it is clear that more innovative medicines and vaccines will be needed for future protection from viruses and other emerging biological threats.

**The best way to prevent and treat those new diseases is to ensure that private American pharmaceutical companies continue their innovative research and vaccine production**.

That way, U.S.-manufactured vaccines can be made available to all Americans quickly. And governments can subsidize their export and sale to other countries far more effectively and less expensively than through compulsory licensing schemes.

Meanwhile, let’s hope Mr. Biden listens to the more reasonable and less-agenda driven voices in this debate and reverses course on the TRIPS waiver.

#### COVID was a precursor to deadlier pandemics—vaccine production will determine everything.

Lander 8/4/21 [Eric Lander, President Biden’s Science Advisory and Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy) “Opinion: As bad as Covid-19 has been, a future pandemic could be even worse—unless we act now” 8/4/21, The Washington Post] RM

[Coronavirus](https://www.washingtonpost.com/coronavirus/?itid=lk_inline_manual_3) vaccines can end the current pandemic if enough people choose to protect themselves and their loved ones by getting vaccinated. But in the years to come, we will still need to defend against a pandemic side effect: collective amnesia.

As public health emergencies recede, societies often quickly forget their experiences — and **fail to prepare for future challenges**. For pandemics, such a course would be disastrous.

**New infectious diseases have been emerging at an accelerating pace,** and they are spreading faster.

Our federal government is responsible for defending the United States against future threats. That’s why President Biden has asked Congress to fund his plan to build on current scientific progress to keep new infectious-disease threats from turning into pandemics like covid-19.

As the president’s science adviser, I know what’s becoming possible. For the first time in our history, we have an opportunity not just to refill our stockpiles but also to transform our capabilities. However, **if we don’t start preparing now for future pandemics, the window for action will close.**

Covid-19 has been a catastrophe: The toll in the United States alone is [more than 614,000 lives](https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2020/national/coronavirus-us-cases-deaths/?itid=lk_inline_manual_11) and has been estimated to exceed [$16 trillion](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2771764), with disproportionate impact on vulnerable and marginalized communities.

But a future pandemic could be even worse — unless we take steps now.

It’s important to remember that the virus behind covid-19 is far less deadly than the 1918 influenza. The virus also belongs to a well-understood family, coronaviruses. It was possible to design vaccines within days of knowing the virus’s genetic code because 20 years of [basic scientific research](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/372/6538/109.full) had revealed which protein to target and how to stabilize it. And while the current virus spins off variants, its mutation rate is slower than that of most viruses.

**Unfortunately, most of the 26 families of viruses that infect humans are less well understood or harder to control**. We have a great deal of work still ahead.

The development of [mRNA vaccine technology](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2020/12/06/covid-vaccine-messenger-rna/?itid=lk_inline_manual_17) — thanks to more than a decade of foresighted basic research — was a game-changer. It shortened the time needed to design and test vaccines to less than a year — far faster than for any previous vaccine. And it’s been surprisingly effective against covid-19.

Still, there’s much more to do. We don’t yet know how mRNA vaccines will perform against other viruses down the road. And **when the next pandemic breaks out, we’ll want to be able to respond even faster.**

Fortunately, the scientific community has been developing a bold plan to keep future viruses from becoming pandemics.

Here are a few of the goals we should shoot for:

The capability to design, test and approve safe and effective vaccines within 100 days of detecting a pandemic threat (for covid-19, that would have meant May 2020); manufacture enough doses to supply the world within 200 days; and speed vaccination campaigns by replacing sterile injections with skin patches.

Diagnostics simple and cheap enough for daily home testing to limit spread and target medical care.

Early-warning systems to spot new biological threats anywhere in the world soon after they emerge and monitor them thereafter.

We desperately need to strengthen our public health system — from expanding the workforce to modernizing labs and data systems — including to ensure that vulnerable populations are protected.

And we need to coordinate actions with our international partners, because pandemics know no borders.

These goals are ambitious, but they’re feasible — provided the work is managed with the seriousness, focus and accountability of NASA’s Apollo Program, which sent humans to the moon.

Importantly, these capabilities won’t just prepare us for future pandemics; they’ll also improve public health and medical care for infectious diseases today.

Preparing for threats is a core national responsibility. That’s why our government invests heavily in missile defense and counterterrorism. We need to similarly protect the nation against biological threats, which range from the ongoing risk of pandemics to the possibility of deliberate use of bioweapons.

Pandemics cause massive death and disruption. From a financial standpoint, they’re also astronomically expensive. If, as might be expected from [history](https://www.cfr.org/timeline/major-epidemics-modern-era) and current trends, we suffered a pandemic of the current scale every two decades, the annualized cost would exceed $500 billion per year. Investing a much smaller amount to avert this toll is an economic and moral imperative.

The White House will put forward a detailed plan this month to ensure that the United States can fully prepare before the next outbreak. It’s hard to imagine a higher economic or human return on national investment.

#### Ecosystem sensitivity from climate change means future pandemics will cause extinction—assumes COVID

Supriya 4/19 [Lakshmi Supriya got her BSc in Industrial Chemistry from IIT Kharagpur (India) and a Ph.D. in Polymer Science and Engineering from Virginia Tech (USA). She has more than a decade of global industry experience working in the USA, Europe, and India. After her Ph.D., she worked as part of the R&D group in diverse industries starting with semiconductor packaging at Intel, Arizona, where she developed a new elastomeric thermal solution, which has now been commercialized and is used in the core i3 and i5 processors. From there she went on to work at two startups, one managing the microfluidics chip manufacturing lab at a biotechnology company and the other developing polymer formulations for oil extraction from oil sands. She also worked at Saint Gobain North America, developing various material solutions for photovoltaics and processing techniques and new applications for fluoropolymers. Most recently, she managed the Indian R&D team of Enthone (now part of MacDermid) developing electroplating technologies for precious metals.) “Humans versus viruses - Can we avoid extinction in near future?” News Medical Life Sciences, 4/19/21, https://www.news-medical.net/news/20210419/Humans-versus-viruses-Can-we-avoid-extinction-in-near-future.aspx] RM

Expert argues that human-caused changes to the environment can lead to the emergence of pathogens, not only from outside but also from our own microbiome, which can pave the way for large-scale destruction of humans and **even our extinction**.

Whenever there is a change in any system, it will cause other changes to reach a balance or equilibrium, generally at a point different from the original balance. Although this principle was originally posited by the French chemist Henry Le Chatelier for chemical reactions, this theory can be applied to almost anything else.

In an essay published on the online server Preprints\*, Eleftherios P. Diamandis of the University of Toronto and the Mount Sinai Hospital, Toronto, argues that changes caused by humans, to the climate, and everything around us will lead to changes that may have a dramatic impact on human life. Because our ecosystems are so complex, we don’t know how our actions will affect us in the long run, so humans generally disregard them.

Changing our environment

Everything around us is changing, from living organisms to the climate, water, and soil. Some estimates say about half the organisms that existed 50 years ago have already become extinct, and about 80% of the species may become extinct in the future.

## 1NC - K

#### Apocalyptic pandemic reps lock in a neoliberal risk society of anxiety and health inequality that spreads disease. Independently, the aff masks health neoliberalism by spreading vaccine arms races horizontally instead of vertically.

Mannathukkaren 14

(Nissim Mannathukkaren, Dept. Chair and Associate Prof. of International Development Studies @ Dalhousie University, “Pandemics in the age of panic,” November 22, 2014, <http://www.thehindu.com/features/magazine/social-media-should-be-a-positive-force-and-public-health-systems-should-focus-on-prevention-of-epidemics/article6624674.ece>)

\*Evidence is edited to correct gendered language\*

If natural disasters induce panic, so do pandemics. In recent years, we have seen a series of pandemics: AIDS, avian influenza, SARS and H1N1. Now, we are in the midst of an epidemic, Ebola, which — according to experts — can acquire pandemic proportions. Natural disasters and pandemics have existed in the pre-modern era as well but what is remarkable is that, in the modern era, the attitudes towards hazards — both natural and man-made — have drastically changed. Panic is the order of the day, especially in sanitised spaces of the developed West. Medical scholars, Luc Bonneux and Wim Van Damme, term panic itself as a pandemic.

As they point out, in 1999, Belgium slaughtered seven million chicken and 60,000 pigs when dioxin, a cancer-causing chemical, entered animal feed. Not one person died from dioxin poisoning. In 2005, the chief avian flu coordinator of the UN predicted that 150 million people could be killed by the flu. However, in 10 years, it has killed less than 400 people. The same apocalyptic predictions were made about BSE/CJD, SARS, and H1N1 as well.

Media coverage and the responses of governments and people to Ebola and recent pandemics tell us an important and paradoxical truth: we might be living in an era that is the apogee of human scientific advancements but this has not necessarily mitigated our fears and panic about potential dangers. This has led theorists to argue that we live in a ‘risk society’, a society that generates a lot of risks precisely because it is obsessed with, as the sociologist Anthony Giddens puts it, “the aspiration to control and particularly with the idea of controlling the future.” Traditional cultures did not have a notion of risk as diseases and natural disasters were taken for granted and were attributed to God or fate.

Interestingly, many of the risks in the modern era, as Giddens elaborates, are manufactured by the “very progression in human development, especially by the progression of science and technology.” Diseases caused by industrial pollution, natural disasters caused by environmental destruction, man-made disasters like Bhopal gas tragedy, Chernobyl and Fukushima nuclear accidents, and latrogenesis — adverse effects caused by medical intervention and modern medicines — are examples of these manufactured risks. In the U.S., scholars estimate that 2,25,000 deaths annually are due to latrogenic causes, and is the third leading cause of death after heart disease and cancer! Thus, science and technology itself generates new uncertainties as it banishes old ones and fear of the unknown cannot be eliminated by further scientific progress.

We have to read the coverage of, and response to, Ebola in this wider context of a risk society. Politics of fear, panic, and scaremongering are inevitable outcomes of such a society. Look at the panic around Ebola in the U.S., where so far not one citizen has died of the disease. A nurse returning after treating Ebola patients in Sierra Leone has won a court order against a mandatory quarantine order imposed by the state. Australia and Canada have imposed visa ban on citizens travelling from the affected countries, violating WHO’s International Health Regulations.

Renowned journalist Simon Jenkins argues that “we have lost control of the language of proportion” in responding to Ebola and other pandemics. Similarly, other journalists have severely criticised the media’s coverage of Ebola. The scaremongering is seen in absurd and irresponsible statements like Ebola is ‘the ISIS of biological agents!’ One major responsibility of the mainstream media, other than providing detailed and proper information about the disease itself, is to enlighten the public about the socio-economic and political conditions that govern health and healthcare systems in various societies, which in turn impact the origin and spread of pandemics. Without educating the public about the root causes that condemn the poorer parts of the world to bear the brunt of global pandemics, the media becomes a handmaiden of the powers — developed countries and pharmaceutical corporations — that control global health.

This lack of knowledge about larger forces also adds to risks and the resultant panic. Thus, in the 2009 H1N1 pandemic, the media’s role in the investigation of allegations of whether it was a false pandemic was nothing to be proud of. The head of health at the Council of Europe had raised questions about the role of pharmaceutical corporations in the declaration of H1N1 as a pandemic. Later, an investigation by the British Medical Journal found that medical experts advising WHO on H1N1 had financial ties with pharmaceutical companies producing the vaccine for the pandemic. As all the developed countries stocked up on the vaccines, reportedly, the pharmaceutical companies made profits ranging from $ 7-10 billion.

In this context, the media’s role in the coverage of pandemics raises questions. Where are the stories in the media about the lack of vaccines for Ebola, 40 years after the disease emerged? Or about the drug firms now in the race to produce a vaccine (the share prices of one of the companies ahead in the race have shot up exponentially)?

While certain prominent Western media houses have definitely pushed the panic button with regard to Ebola, the hard data about the overall coverage as studied by the Foreign Policy magazine indicates that it is not the case. But this study is merely restricted to the English language coverage. Further, the mainstream media has failed miserably in countering the serious issue of the racialisation of Ebola (as with AIDS before) as an African disease caused and spread merely by its cultural practices.

In a risk society, we have to confront new unknowns too, like social media and its impact. One media source called Ebola ‘the first major outbreak in the era of social media’. But, in the coverage of the outbreak, social media has reportedly been a negative force spreading misinformation and rumours that, in some cases, even led to deaths due to dangerous treatments administered.

#### The alternative is to adopt a social medicine approach to health.

Mohan J. DUTTA 15, Professor and Head of the Department of Communications and New Media at the National University of Singapore, Adjunct Professor of Communication at the Brian Lamb School of Communication at Purdue University [*Neoliberal Health Organizing*, 2015, p. 231-234]

Latin American social medicine depicts a distinct and long strand of theorizing of health systems that challenges the liberal capitalist organizing of health, grounded in the organizing principles of social medicine and noting [END PAGE 231] that changing the overarching structures is central to transforming the conditions of poor health (Waitzkin, 1991, 2011; Waitzkin & Modell, 1974). That health is constituted within broader social conditions is the basis for research, teaching, clinical practice, and activism in socialist medicine, with early roots in Latin America. Social medicine thus connects health, healing, and health care delivery to the politics of social change and structural transformation, clearly voicing an activist agenda directed at transforming the unequal social conditions.

One of the earliest influences of social medicine was evident in the work of the medical student activist Salvador Allende, who would later become the president of Chile. In his book The Chilean Medico-Social Reality, Allende (1939) outlined the social conditions in Chile that resulted in poor health outcomes, emphasizing the broader conditions of foreign debt dependence, underdevelopment, international dependence, and resource consolidation in the hands of the local elite. Proposing social rather than medical solutions to health, Allende emphasized “income redistribution, state regulation of food and clothing supplies, a national housing program, and industrial reforms to address occupational health problems” (Waitzkin, 2011, p. 160). In his political life, Allende sought reforms in the Chilean national health service, complemented by reforms in the housing and nutrition areas, efforts at national income redistribution, and minimizing the role of multinational corporations.

The individualized model of public health that sees health and illness as a dichotomy is interrogated by the framework of social medicine that suggests that health and illness exist in a dialectical relationship that is dynamic and is continually shifting on the basis of social conditions, structures, cultural practices, economic production, reproduction, marginalizing practices, and processes of political participation. Thus, interventions in social medicine point toward the necessity for transforming the underlying relationships of production and resource distribution, resisting the public health narrative of interventions as mechanisms for improving economic productivity. Taking a social-class-driven approach to health inequities, Latin American social medicine sees the problems with health being situated within means of economic production, patterns of ownership of means of production, and control over productive processes. Therefore, health is approached from the framework of transforming the processes of economic production and labor processes.

The dominant framework of health as integral to growth and economic productivity is questioned by the framework of social medicine that situates the relationship between health and illness amid the very processes of economic organization, distribution of economic resources, and the pervasive effects of social class on health services and health outcomes. [END PAGE 232] The innovations in organizing of health structures in Chile, Cuba, Mexico, Bolivia, and Venezuela offer invaluable insights about the possibilities of alternative organizing that seek to redo the entire structure of social organizing that constitute health. The strong health indicators in Cuba demonstrate the effectiveness of a health system that is committed to addressing the structural determinants of health, creating equitable contexts for the realization and delivery of health (Campion & Morrissey, 2013). Social medicine research has looked at the relations among work, reproduction, the environment, and health, describing in-depth the material conditions that constitute health. For instance, researchers studying health in Mexico within the context of unions and local communities have documented health problems that relate to work processes and the environment. Similarly, researchers in Chile have documented the relations between gender, work, and environmental conditions. A key strand of social medicine examines the relationship between violence and health, connecting violence to poverty, the structures of organizing, and the inequities in ownership of processes of economic production. Investigations of violence attached to the U.S.-supported dictatorship in Chile, the violence connected to narcotics traffic and paramilitary operations, and the violence within the broader structures of the state-imperial networks draw linkages to the broader political economic configurations of neoliberalism.

Emerging from the broader framework of social medicine, the Barrio Adentro movement in Venezuela, started by former president Hugo Chavez, offers insights into structures and processes of alternative organizing of health, connecting local community structures, community ownership, and community solutions with state infrastructures and state-driven public health resources and solutions (Briggs & Mantini-Briggs, 2009; Muntaner et al., 2006; Waitzkin, 2011). The state-driven referendum by the Chavez government to create public health infrastructures and structures of delivery of integrated family medicine, build preventive infrastructures, and develop community health resources in extremely marginalized communities is supported by massive mass-based participation in popular politics and widespread community participation in developing local community infrastructures, community-based resources of problem solving, and community decision-making capacities. The community health centers built within the barrios serve approximately 250 families and are staffed with one integrated family care doctor, one community health worker, and one health promoter. The community health centers are stocked with medical supplies. The health team not only provides health care but also conducts health surveys in the communities and makes home visits for patients that are too ill to travel to the health centers. The Barrio Adentro is integrated with other missiones addressing education, food insecurity, housing, and [END PAGE 233] unemployment, addressing health within a broader structural context (Muntaner et al., 2006). Local community participatory processes are connected with state-driven processes of building community health infrastructures at the local level.

The narrative of Barrio Adentro offers an alternative to the neoliberal narrative of the community in mainstream health communication and yet is marked by its absence from disciplinary discourses. Similarly, social medicine and its tradition of addressing the structural contexts of health is marked by its absence from the dominant discourses of health communication. A review of the two major collections of health communication scholarship, The Routledge Handbook of Health Communication and The Handbook of Global Health Communication, depicts the marked absence of the Latin American innovations of social medicine from the discursive space. Opportunities for resistance to neoliberal organizing of health structures and the invitation to imagine alternative possibilities is grounded in materially grounded concrete politics of popular participation in supporting state policies for building public health and health care infrastructures, complemented by local processes of participation in the creation of health solutions.

As the debate on global warming continues, according to data, the last six years have been the warmest on record. Global warming is melting ice, and sea levels have been increasing. The changing climate is causing more and more wildfires, which are leading to other related damage. At the same time, increased flooding is causing large-scale devastation.

One question that arises is how much environmental damage have humans already done? A recent study compared the natural biomass on Earth to the mass produced by humans and found humans produce a mass equal to their weight every week. This human-made mass is mainly for buildings, roads, and plastic products.

In the early 1900s, human-made mass was about 3% of the global biomass. Today both are about equal. Projections say by 2040, the human-made mass will be triple that of Earth’s biomass. But, slowing down human activity that causes such production may be difficult, given it is considered part of our growth as a civilization.

Emerging pathogens

Although we are made up of human cells, we have almost ten times that of bacteria just in our guts and more on our skin. These microbes not only affect locally but also affect the entire body. There is a balance between the good and bad bacteria, and any change in the environment may cause this balance to shift, especially on the skin, the consequences of which are unknown.

Although most bacteria on and inside of us are harmless, gut bacteria can also have viruses. If viruses don’t kill the bacteria immediately, they can incorporate into the bacterial genome and stay latent for a long time until reactivation by environmental factors, when they can become pathogenic. They can also escape from the gut and enter other organs or the bloodstream. Bacteria can then use these viruses to kill other bacteria or help them evolve to more virulent strains.

An example of the evolution of pathogens is the cause of the current pandemic, the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Several mutations are now known that make the virus more infectious and resistant to immune responses, and strengthening its to enter cells via surface receptors.

The brain

There is evidence that the SARS-CoV-2 can also affect the brain. The virus may enter the brain via the olfactory tract or through the angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) pathway. Viruses can also affect our senses, such as a loss of smell and taste, and there could be other so far unkown neurological effects. The loss of smell seen in COVID-19 could be a new viral syndrome specific to this disease.

Many books and movies have described pandemics caused by pathogens that wipe out large populations and cause severe diseases. In the essay, the author provides a hypothetical scenario where a gut bacteria suddenly starts producing viral proteins. Some virions spread through the body and get transmitted through the human population. After a few months, the virus started causing blindness, and within a year, large populations lost their vision.

Pandemics can cause other diseases that can threaten humanity’s entire existence. **The COVID-19 pandemic brought this possibility to the forefront**. If we continue disturbing the equilibrium between us and the environment, we don’t know what the consequences may be and **the next pandemic could lead us to extinction.**

# Case

### Case

**FW-Moral uncertainty means preventing extinction should be our highest priority.  
Bostrom 12** [Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)]  
These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ **Our present understanding of axiology might** well **be confused. We may not** nowknow — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet **be able to imagine the best ends** of our journey. **If we are** indeedprofoundly **uncertain** about our ultimate aims,then we should recognize that **there is a great** option **value in preserving** — and ideally improving — **our ability to recognize value and** to **steer the future accordingly. Ensuring** that **there will be a future** version of **humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value.** To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

Vote neg on presumption – the compulsory licensing clause and exception in TRIPS is the same as the aff—proves no solvency b/c generic vaccines havent been made

#### No impact—global econ’s resilient, no protectionism or conflict from decline—aggregate data concludes

Drezner 14—professor of international politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University

(Daniel, “The System Worked: Global Economic Governance during the Great Recession”, World Politics / Volume 66 / Issue 01 / January 2014, pp 123-164, dml)

The final significant outcome addresses a dog that hasn’t barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.42 They voiced genuine concern that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict—whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fueled impressions of a surge in global public disorder. The aggregate data suggest otherwise, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has concluded that “the average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”43 Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis, as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict, as Lotta Themnér and Peter Wallensteen conclude: “[T]he pattern is one of relative stability when we consider the trend for the past five years.”44 The secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed. Rogers Brubaker observes that “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”45

#### Econ’s resilient – shocks don’t spill over

Posen, 16 – Adam S. Posen, president of the Peterson Institute for International Economics and external voting member of the Bank of England’s rate-setting Monetary Policy Committee, “Chapter 1: Why We Need a Reality Check”, REALITY CHECK FOR THE GLOBAL ECONOMY, Peterson Institute for International Economics, PIIE Briefing 16-3, March 2016

A combination of public policies and decentralized private-sector responses to the crisis have **increased** our **economic resilience**, diminished the **systemic spillovers between economies**, and even created some room for **additional stimulus** if needed. Large parts of the global financial system are better capitalized, monitored, and frankly more risk averse than they were a decade ago, with less leverage. The riskier parts of today’s global economy are less directly linked to the center’s growth and financing than when the troubles were within the United States and most of Europe in 2008. Trade imbalances of many key economies are smaller, though growing, and thus accumulations of foreign debt vulnerabilities are also smaller than a decade ago. Most central banks are now **so committed to stabilization** that they are attacked for being too loose or supportive of markets, making them at least unlikely to repeat some policy errors from 2007–10 of delaying loosening or even excessive tightening. Finally, corporate and household balance sheets are far more solid in the US and some other major economies than they were a decade ago (though not universally), and even in China the perceptions of balance sheet weakness exceed the reality in scope and scale.

#### The economy is resilient—checks and empirics.

Doll 16 – Bob Doll, Chief Equity Strategist at Nuveen Asset Management, “Despite Lackluster Growth, Equities Remain Attractive”, Financial Advisor, 8-9, http://www.fa-mag.com/news/despite-lackluster-growth--equities-remain-attractive-28409.html

July’s jobs report confirmed that U.S. economic growth remains on track. 255,000 new jobs were created last month, the unemployment rate remained at 4.9% and average hourly earnings climbed 0.3%.2 These stronger-than-expected results raise the chances of a Fed rate hike before year end. Long-term U.S. growth has been lackluster and will likely remain so. Since the start of the recovery seven years ago, real gross domestic product growth has averaged just over 2%.3 **Tailwinds** such as the **improving labor market** and **low mortgage rates** have been **counteracted** by headwinds such as **low business confidence**. We expect these **crosscurrents** will persist. Nominal growth has been particularly weak this cycle. Compared to previous expansions, nominal growth (which includes the effects of inflation) has been extremely low.3 Since nominal growth is determined by both unit growth and pricing power, this trend has been a primary culprit behind recent weakness in corporate earnings. Increases in government spending are a mixed bag for the economy. After several years of a sequester-enforced decline in spending, government spending has increased in 2016.4 While this boosts economic growth, additional regulations and increased control of private resources through stringent health insurance rules limit the economy’s ability to promote higher standards of living. China’s economy is slowing, but the rate should be manageable. Fears of a Chinese hard landing have been a persistent worry for investors. Chinese authorities have been slowly shifting the country’s economy away from exports and investment spending and toward domestic consumption. We believe Chinese growth is slowing from the officially reported 10% level of a few years ago toward something closer to a more-sustainable 5% by the end of this decade.5 Despite Risks, the Global Economy **Remains Resilient** Since the current economic recovery began, investors have contended with a number of **economic issues**. The most recent risk has been the extent to which the **Brexit** vote might trigger widespread contagion. So far, it appears that outside of slowing growth in the United Kingdom, effects have been **limited**. Investor worries are now focused on **Italy**’s banking and political systems. Italian banks are struggling with a rash of bad loans on their balance sheets and thin capital buffers. This storm has been brewing for some time, and coincides with the upcoming constitutional referendum that could reshape Italy’s political system. Investors are rightfully viewing the turmoil with caution. In addition, many are questioning the overall state of the world economy in light of **rising geopolitical instability**, consternation over the **upcoming U.S. elections**, questions about **global monetary policy**, **relatively low business confidence** and a **renewed slump in oil prices**. Yet, we believe the global economy has been, and should continue to be, **resilient in the face of all of these risks**. We believe global monetary policy **remains supportive** of growth and the global recovery **will continue, especially in the United States**

#### Waiving IP enforcement results in rampant increase in counterfeit vaccines – turns case.

Mercurio 21 (Bryan Mercurio is a Professor and Vice-Chancellor's Outstanding Fellow of the Faculty of Law at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, February 21, 2021, <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3789820&download=yes>) CS

6. IP enforcement is of vital importance to maintaining safety standards.

The protection of IP not only provides incentives to innovators to create, but also plays a crucial role in ensuring the safety of vaccines and helping to prevent the importation **of fraudulent and dangerous goods**. Unlike the typical pharmaceutical industry, the vaccine market is not a free and open market.69 Vaccines contain biological products made from living organisms and the risk of failure in vaccine development and production is high. 70 Moreover, the manufacturing process for vaccines is much more complex as it requires the use of facilities and equipment with a high degree of specialization.71 The complexity of vaccine products implies that more time and regulatory requirements are needed in order to make or “copy” the vaccine production process. Therefore, the innovator should be expected to make conscious and meticulous decisions as to when and to whom to issue licences, as this is the most responsible way to bring their technologies to the world and safeguard global health.

In addition, as the COVID-19 pandemic continues there has been a **noticeable increase in the circulation of fake medicines** around the world. According to the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol), **organized crime groups** have been producing fake drugs and medical products and selling them for **lucrative profits in developing countries**.72 With the development of COVID-19 vaccines on the market, a rapid rise in the illegal sale of fake items is expected, according to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).73 Counterfeits of the legitimate products provide false promises of protection and could lead to **disastrous consequences**, including **worsened illness and** **death** for the individual and the retardation of herd immunity for the population at large. Effective and proactive **IP** procurement is **essential** and useful in mitigating the risks of counterfeit and substandard medicines. IP enforcement measures play a significant role in preventing these fake and illicit medicines from circulating in the market. While important during normal times, IP enforcement can take on an enhanced role of safeguarding the public during this critical period of time. Waiving all COVID-19 related IPRs raises the risk of unsafe or fake vaccines circulating in supply channels and being sold to unsuspecting governments, **putting millions of human lives at risk** and reducing trust in vaccines.

#### Vaccine IP is insufficient for imitation; originators will challenge with intense litigation, and nations don’t have necessary ingredients and materials. Independently, the plan will cause companies to disengage from global efforts.

Silverman 3/15 [Rachel Silverman is a policy fellow at the Center for Global Development where she leads policy-oriented research on global health financing and incentive structures. Silverman’s current research focuses on the practical application of results-based financing; global health transitions; efficient global health procurement; innovation models for global health; priority-setting for UHC; alignment and impact in international funding for family planning; and strategies to strengthen evidence and accountability. BA with distinction in international relations and economics from Stanford University.) “Waiving vaccine patents won’t help inoculate poorer nations” Washington Post, PostEverything Perspective, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/03/15/vaccine-coronavirus-patents-waive-global-equity/>] RM

According to some activists, the solution to this inequity is relatively simple: By suspending protections on covid-19 vaccine patents, the international community “could help break Big Pharma monopolies and increase supplies so there are enough doses for everyone, everywhere,” [claims](https://peoplesvaccine.org/take-action/)the People’s Vaccine Alliance. Indeed, 58 low- and middle-income countries have mobilized in support of a proposed World Trade Organization [waiver](https://docs.wto.org/dol2fe/Pages/SS/directdoc.aspx?filename=q:/IP/C/W669.pdf&Open=True) that would temporarily exempt [coronavirus](https://www.washingtonpost.com/coronavirus/?itid=lk_inline_manual_4)-related intellectual property from normal international rules and protections. And while the effort to waive IP protections has been a global health hot topic for months, it gained a high-profile endorsement in the United States recently from Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.). In a March 10 video statement, Sanders [called upon President Biden](https://twitter.com/GlobalJusticeUK/status/1369734275818549252?s=20) to support the IP suspension while slamming “huge, multibillion-dollar pharmaceutical companies [that] continue to prioritize profits by protecting their monopolies.”

The logic of the argument seems clear and intuitive — at first. Without patents, which serve narrow commercial interests, companies all over the world could freely produce the vaccine. Sure, Big Pharma would lose money — but this is a pandemic, and human life comes before private profit, especially when vaccines receive substantial public financing to support research and development. As with HIV drugs in years past, widespread generic production would dramatically increase supply and drive down prices to levels affordable even in the developing world.

Reality is more complicated, however. Because of the technical complexity of manufacturing coronavirus vaccines, waiving intellectual-property rights, by itself, would have little effect**.** **It could even backfire, with companies using the move as an excuse to disengage from global access efforts**. **There are more effective ways to entice — and to pressure — companies to license and share their intellectual property and the associated know-how, without broadly nullifying patents.**

The Moderna vaccine illustrates the limits of freeing up intellectual property. Moderna [announced in October](https://investors.modernatx.com/news-releases/news-release-details/statement-moderna-intellectual-property-matters-during-covid-19) that it would not enforce IP rights on its coronavirus vaccine — and yet it has taken no steps to share information about the vaccine’s design or manufacture, citing commercial interests in the underlying technology. Five months later, production of the Moderna vaccine remains entirely under the company’s direct control within its owned and contracted facilities. Notably, Moderna is also the only manufacturer of a U.S.- or British-approved vaccine [not yet participating in Covax](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/coronavirus-vaccine-access-poor-countries-moderna/2021/02/12/0586e532-6712-11eb-bf81-c618c88ed605_story.html?itid=lk_inline_manual_9), a global-aid-funded effort (including a [pledged $4 billion from the United States](https://www.npr.org/2021/02/18/969145224/biden-to-announce-4-billion-for-global-covid-19-vaccine-effort)) to purchase vaccines for use in low- and middle-income countries.

It is true, however, that activist pressure — including threats to infringe upon IP rights — can encourage originators to enter into voluntary licensing arrangements. So the global movement to liberate the vaccine patents may be useful, even if some advocates make exaggerated claims about the effects of waivers on their own.

One reason patent waivers are unlikely to help much in this case is that vaccines are harder to make than ordinary drugs. Because most drugs are simple chemical compounds, and because the composition of the compounds is easily analyzable, competent chemists can usually reverse-engineer a production process with relative ease. When a drug patent expires, therefore — or is waived — generic companies can readily enter the market and produce competitive products, [lowering prices dramatically](https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/center-drug-evaluation-and-research-cder/generic-competition-and-drug-prices).

Vaccines, in contrast, are complex biological products. Observing their contents is insufficient to allow for imitation. **Instead, to produce the vaccine, manufacturers need access to the developer’s “soft” IP — the proprietary recipe, cell lines, manufacturing processes and so forth**. While some of this information is confidentially submitted to regulators and might theoretically be released in an extraordinary situation (though not without legal challenge), manufacturers are at an enormous disadvantage without the originator’s cooperation to help them set up their process and kick-start production. Even with the nonconsensual release of the soft IP held by the regulator, the process of trial and error would cause long delays in a best-case scenario. Most likely, the effort would end in expensive failure. Manufacturers also need certain raw ingredients and other materials, like glass vials and filtration equipment; overwhelming demand, paired with disruptive export restrictions, has constricted the global availability of some of these items.

#### Underinvestment and regulation drive vaccine inefficiency---licenses are already available

Tabarrok 5/6/21 [Alex Tabarrok is Bartley J. Madden Chair in Economics at the Mercatus Center and a professor of economics at George Mason University. Along with Tyler Cowen, he is the co-author of the popular economics blog Marginal Revolution and co-founder of Marginal Revolution University. He is the author of numerous academic papers in the fields of law and economics, criminology, regulatory policy, voting theory and other areas in political economy. He is co-author with Tyler of Modern Principles of Economics, a widely used introductory textbook. He gave a TED talk in 2009. His articles have appeared in the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, and many other publications.) “Patents are not the problem!” Marginal Revolution University, 5/6/21, Current Affairs, Economics, Law, Medicine, <https://marginalrevolution.com/marginalrevolution/2021/05/ip-is-not-the-constraint.html>] RM

For the last year and a half I have been shouting from the rooftops, “invest in capacity, build more factories, shore up the supply lines, spend billions to save trillions.” Fortunately, some boffins in the Biden administration have found a better way, “the US supports the waiver of IP protections on COVID-19 vaccines to help end the pandemic.”

Waive IP protections. So simple. Why didn’t I think of that???

**Patents are not the problem**. All of the vaccine manufacturers are trying to increase supply as quickly as possible. Billions of doses are being produced–more than ever before in the history of the world. Licenses are widely available. **AstraZeneca have licensed their vaccine for production with manufactures around the world, including in India, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, China and South Africa**. J&J’s vaccine has been licensed for production by multiple firms in the United States as well as with firms in Spain, South Africa and France. Sputnik has been licensed for production by firms in India, China, South Korea, Brazil and pending EMA approval with firms in Germany and France. Sinopharm has been licensed in the UAE, Egypt and Bangladesh. Novavax has licensed its vaccine for production in South Korea, India, and Japan and it is desperate to find other licensees but t**echnology transfer isn’t easy and there are limited supplies of raw materials:**

Virtually overnight, [Novavax] set up a network of outside manufacturers more ambitious than one outside executive said he’s ever seen, but they struggled at times to transfer their technology there amid pandemic travel restrictions. They were kicked out of one factory by the same government that’s bankrolled their effort. Competing with larger competitors, they’ve found themselves short on raw materials as diverse as Chilean tree bark and bioreactor bags. They signed a deal with India’s Serum Institute to produce many of their COVAX doses but now face the realistic chance that even when Serum gets to full capacity — and they are behind — India’s government, dealing with the world’s worst active outbreak, won’t let the shots leave the country.

Plastic bags are a bigger bottleneck than patents. The US embargo on vaccine supplies to India was precisely that the Biden administration used the DPA to prioritize things like bioreactor bags and filters to US suppliers and that meant that India’s Serum Institute was having trouble getting its production lines ready for Novavax. CureVac, another potential mRNA vaccine, is also finding it difficult to find supplies due to US restrictions (which means supplies are short everywhere). As Derek Lowe said:

Abolishing patents will not provide more shaker bags or more Chilean tree bark, nor provide more of the key filtration materials needed for production. These processes have a lot of potential choke points and rate-limiting steps in them, and there is no wand that will wave that complexity away.

Technology transfer has been difficult for AstraZeneca–which is one reason they have had production difficulties–and their vaccine uses relatively well understood technology. The mRNA technology is new and has never before been used to produce at scale. Pfizer and Moderna had to build factories and distribution systems from scratch. There are no mRNA factories idling on the sidelines. If there were, Moderna or Pfizer would be happy to license since they are producing in their own factories 24 hours a day, seven days a week (monopolies restrict supply, remember?). **Why do you think China hasn’t yet produced an mRNA vaccine? Hint: it isn’t fear about violating IP**. Moreover, even Moderna and Pfizer don’t yet fully understand their production technology, they are learning by doing every single day. **Moderna has said that they won’t enforce their patents during the pandemic but no one has stepped up to produce because no one else can.**

The US trade representative’s announcement is virtue signaling to the anti-market left and will do little to nothing to increase supply.

What can we do to increase supply? Sorry, there is no quick and cheap solution. We must spend. Trump’s Operation Warp Speed spent on the order of $15 billion. If we want more, we need to spend more and on similar scale. The Biden administration paid $269 million to Merck to retool its factories to make the J&J vaccine. That was a good start. We could also offer Pfizer and Moderna say $100 a dose to produce in excess of their current production and maybe with those resources there is more they could do. South Africa and India and every other country in the world should offer the same (India hasn’t even approved the Pfizer vaccine and they are complaining about IP!??) We should ease up on the DPA and invest more in the supply chain–let’s get CureVac and the Serum Institute what they need. We should work like hell to find a substitute for Chilean tree bark. See my piece in Science co-authored with Michael Kremer et. al. for more ideas. (Note also that these ideas are better at dealing with current supply constraints and they also increase the incentive to produce future vaccines, unlike shortsighted patent abrogation.)

Bottom line is that producing more takes real resources not waving magic patent wands.

You may have gathered that I am angry. I am indeed angry that the people in power think they can solve real problems on the cheap and at someone else’s expense. This is not serious. I am also angry that they are sending the wrong message about business, profits and capitalism. So let me end on positive note. Like the Apollo program and Dunkirk, the creation of the mRNA vaccines by Pfizer and Moderna should be lauded with Nobel prizes and major movies. Churchill called the rescue at Dunkirk a “miracle of deliverance,” well the miracle of Moderna will rescue many more. Not only was a vaccine designed in under a year, an entirely new production process was set up to produce billions of doses to rescue the world. The creation of the mRNA vaccines was a triumph of science, logistics, and management and it was done at a speed that I had thought possible only for past generations.

c [Tamara Kay is a sociologist studying trade, global health and globalization at the Keough School of Global Affairs, University of Notre Dame. Adnan Naseemullah is an international relations scholar at King's College London. Susan Ostermann is a political scientist at the Keough School of Global Affairs, Notre Dame and a former attorney at O'Melveny & Myers LLP, specializing in intellectual property law.) “Waiving patents isn't enough — we need technology transfer to defeat COVID” The Hil, Opinion Contributors: Healthcare, 5/13/21, 2:01 PM EDT, <https://thehill.com/opinion/healthcare/553368-waiving-patents-isnt-enough-we-need-technology-transfer-to-defeat-covid?rl=1>] RM

On May 5, U.S. Trade Representative Katherine Tai announced that the Biden administration would support a waiver of intellectual property (IP) restrictions for coronavirus vaccines to enable low-income countries to vaccinate their populations. While such a waiver is necessary to stem the global COVID-19 pandemic, it is not sufficient. What is missing from discussions of intellectual property is that **few of the countries with the potential to produce sophisticated pharmaceutical products currently have the technological capacity to manufacture mRNA and adenovirus vaccines to global standards.** This is because of the highly concentrated nature of the global pharmaceutical industry, which has impeded the transfer of production technology beyond a handful of countries.

Even after U.S. support of the IP waiver, significant obstacles to increased vaccine production and distribution remain. Primary among them is continuing resistance by profit-concerned pharmaceutical companies to sharing their technological expertise more broadly with capable partners, and the governments in high-income countries that support these strategies.

Corporations argue that, particularly for the mRNA vaccines, **wider distribution and production are prohibitively difficult due to the complex and relatively new technology involved.**

There is some truth in this. The genetic sequence of the virus is already publicly available. The safe transfer of this sequence to human bodies, via mRNA or an inactivated adenovirus, by contrast, is a complicated and sophisticated operation. Pharmaceutical companies argue this process needs to be kept in capable hands. They argue that they are the only ones with this capacity, and have received and continue to receive tremendous public funding as a result. None are offering up their expertise and, in particular, technology that they deem trade secrets, for wider public use, which would dramatically widen production and distribution capability beyond wealthy countries.

However, in light of the significant public funding already invested, the windfall profits already achieved and the significant public interest at stake, we can and should do more than support an intellectual property waiver to enable capacity building for pharmaceutical manufacturing and distribution in low-income countries. Vaccine producers are essentially realizing their profits as government contractors, and it is in the interest of the U.S. government for the pandemic to end globally, not just in the U.S. This will occur only if low-income countries can make and distribute vaccines.

We already see some examples of production beyond the West. The Serum Institute of India already produces a large proportion of the AstraZeneca vaccine bound for Europe. There is no reason why it and other Indian manufacturers, and those in other countries with emerging scientific and technological capacity, could not produce much more for the developing world over the next year. This was envisioned by the WHO’s C-TAP program. But Pfizer and Moderna, with the backing of the Trump administration, opposed this program.

Yet given the global threat — a threat which will not truly diminish locally until it diminishes globally — we should create incentives for them to lend their expertise and support to manufacturing partners of their own choosing in low-income countries to radically expand production capacity.

#### Circumvention and they don’t solve – even if they say “durable fiat”, they have not defined the scope of the plan in the 1AC so you don’t know what the plan would materially look like
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The role of intellectual property rights (IPRs) and access to medicines is contentious. On the one hand, IPRs encourage investment, innovation and the advancement of health science. On the other hand, the limited-term monopoly rights can result in artificially high prices and become a barrier to access to medicines. While the wisdom of the IPRs system has at times been tested, it has proven its value in the current COVID-19 pandemic as IPRs played a large role in the rapid (and unprecedented) development and availability of multiple vaccines. Despite the success, India and South Africa proposed that the World Trade Organization (WTO) waive IPRs under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement) in order to increase access to vaccines and other COVID-19-related technologies.[1](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn1) The proposal, tabled at a meeting of the TRIPS Council in October 2020, calls on Members to waive IPRs relating to and having an impact on the “prevention, containment or treatment of COVID-19”.[2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn2) The proposal attracted support from the majority of developing country Members,[3](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn3) but was opposed by a handful of Members including the United States (US).[4](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn4) Given that consensus could not be reached within the deadline of 90 days as set out in Art. IX:3 of the Agreement Establishing the WTO, Members agreed to keep the waiver proposal on the agenda of the TRIPS Council in 2021.[5](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn5) On 5 May 2021, the US reversed its position and announced that it would support a waiver for COVID-19 vaccines.[6](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn6) To be clear, this does not mean that the US supported the waiver as proposed by India and South Africa. Instead, the US has simply agreed to negotiate the perimeters of a waiver. Others, including the European Union (EU), Canada, Australia, Norway, Switzerland, the United Kingdom (UK) and even leading developing countries such as Brazil, Chile and Mexico remain opposed or lukewarm on the waiver.[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn7) The US dropping opposition does not mean the concerns of other Members will simply disappear – one would hope that these nations opposed the waiver for valid reasons and did not simply blindly follow the US. Indeed, many of the above-listed Members remain unconvinced that even such a draconian step as a waiver of IPRs would accomplish the goal of increased vaccine production.[8](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn8) For its part, the EU continues to favour an approach which makes better use of existing flexibilities available in the TRIPS Agreement.[9](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn9) Thus, those expecting quick agreement on the waiver will be disappointed. Negotiations at the WTO are always difficult and lengthy, and US Trade Representative Katherine Tai acknowledged that the “negotiations will take time given the consensus-based nature of the institution and the complexity of the issues involved”.[10](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn10) Issues of negotiation will include the scope of the waiver. Whereas the original proposal and its amended form extend the waiver beyond patents and vaccines to include nearly all forms of IP (i.e. copyright,[11](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn11) industrial designs and trade secrets) as well as to all “health products and technologies including diagnostics, therapeutics, vaccines, medical devices, personal protective equipment, their materials or components, and their methods and means of manufacture for the prevention, treatment or containment of COVID-19”[12](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn12) (with no requirement on how or the extent to which they are related to or useful in combatting COVID-19), the US and others seem to support a waiver limited to patents and vaccines.[13](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn13) The length of the waiver will also be a contentious negotiating issue, with proponents seeking a virtual indefinite waiver lasting until the Membership agrees by consensus that it is no longer required – meaning even a single Member’s objection to ending the waiver would mean the waiver continues to remain in force[14](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn14) – as will the request that any action claimed to be taken under the waiver is outside the scope of the WTO’s dispute settlement mechanism.[15](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn15) These provisions will almost certainly be opposed by other Members, who would perhaps agree to a time-limited waiver which could be extended rather than an unchallengeable indefinite waiver which will be difficult to reverse. The proposal also fails to mention anything in relation to transparency and notification requirements and lacks safeguards against abuse or diversion. These points will likely also prove contentious in the negotiations. With so many initial divergences and as yet undiscussed issues, the negotiations at best could be completed by the time of the next WTO Ministerial Conference, scheduled to begin on 20 November 2021. There is precedent in this regard, as previous TRIPS negotiations involving IP and pharmaceuticals were not fully resolved until the days before the Ministerial Conferences (in 2003 and 2005).[16](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn16) There is also a chance that the negotiations will continue past the calendar year 2021. The chance for a swift negotiation diminished with the release of a revised proposal by India and South Africa on 22 May 2021. As mentioned above, the proposal contains no limit as to product coverage, scope, notification requirements or safeguards and proposes that the waiver will remain in effect for what could be an indefinite period. This was not a proposal designed to engender quick negotiations and a solution. Instead, the proposal perhaps reveals India’s and South Africa’s true intent to use the COVID-19 pandemic as an excuse to roll-back IPRs rather than a good-faith effort to rapidly increase access to lifesaving vaccines and treatments around the world. It is not only the length of time which is an issue but also the ultimate impact of the waiver. A waiver simply means that a WTO Member would not be in violation of its WTO obligations if it does not protect and enforce the COVID-19-related IPRs for the duration of the waiver. The waiver would thus allow Members to deviate from their international obligations but not obligate Members to suspend protection and enforcement of the IPRs. Members like the US who support the waiver may not implement the necessary domestic legislation to waive IPRs within the jurisdiction. It is questionable whether the US could even legally implement the waiver given that IPRs are a matter of constitutional law.[17](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn17) The US announcement remains meaningful, however, for two reasons. First, it signals a departure from the longstanding and bipartisan support for the pharmaceutical industry, which for decades has been instrumental in setting the IP and trade agenda.[18](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn18) Second, it sends a strong signal that the US does not oppose others from waiving patent protection for vaccines. This shift may also be part of a broader and alternative strategy to increase vaccine production and distribution, whereby the US is not viewing or supporting waiver negotiations as a legal tool but more so as a threat to encourage vaccine innovators to increase production. In essence, the desired reaction would be that the IP holders increase efforts to license, transfer technology and expand manufacturing – exactly what the world needs at this time. Alan Beattie, writing in the Financial Times, believes that even the proponents of the waiver desire this outcome: “having talked to the proponents, [the original proposal] was always a tactical position designed to start a debate, identify possible support and flush out opponents rather than a likely outcome. To that end, it seems to have worked rather well.”[19](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn19) India’s negotiator to the TRIPS Agreement and longtime WTO staffer, Jayashree Watal, agrees, stating the proposal is an “indirect attempt to put pressure on the original manufacturers to cooperate [and license production to companies in their countries]”.[20](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn20) This view makes sense, as the proponents (and their supporters) have not even pointed to one credible instance where IPRs have blocked the production of a COVID-19 vaccine. Moreover, it is well known that the leading vaccines using mRNA are difficult to reproduce and having the “blueprints” does not guarantee safe and effective production. Simply stated, if a pastry chef provides instructions on how to bake a cake, the cake they bake is still going to be better than cakes baked by novices using the exact same recipe. The know-how and trade secrets are the key ingredient to the manufacture of quality, safe and effective pharmaceuticals or vaccines, and not only is it not transferred through compulsory licenses but it is hard to imagine how any government would force the transfer of such information even under a waiver. For this reason, instead of encouraging production everywhere – including in locations where safety and efficacy standards are virtually nonexistent – and accepting that there will be a flood of substandard vaccines coming onto the world market (with devastating effects) it is much more sensible to find out where potential manufacturing capabilities exist and find ways to exploit them and scale them up. When asked if a waiver would improve vaccine availability and equity, Watal responded: “No. It won’t. That’s clear.”[21](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn21) I share Watal’s view and do not support a TRIPS waiver for IPRs or even a limited waiver for patents. With evidence mounting that “what the proposal … will definitely not achieve is speeding up the Covid-19 vaccination rate in India or other parts of the Global South”[22](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn22) I refuse to sacrifice academic integrity by supporting a proposal simply because it is gaining traction in some circles.[23](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn23) IPRs played a key role in delivering vaccines within a year of the discovery of a new pathogen; it seems inexplicable that the world would abandon the system without any evidence that IPRs are limiting during the current crisis.[24](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn24) Moreover, innovators have been generous in licensing technology transfer and production and one would be hard-pressed to find credible reports of qualified generic producers being refused a license. This is not surprising, since multiple competing vaccines are on the market it simply does not make economic sense for innovators to refuse a license – the generic manufacturer would simply obtain a license (and market share) and pay royalties to a competitor. Instead, I support efforts to enable prompt and effective use of existing flexibilities in the TRIPS Agreement and concerted and coordinated efforts involving governments and the private sector to ensure all qualified generic producers willing and capable of manufacturing vaccines are doing so and to create supply by working to bring more facilities up to standard. Cooperation will not only lead us out of this pandemic but also put us in a better position to deal with the next one. Killing the goose that laid the golden egg may seem appealing to some in the short term but will only ensure that no eggs are delivered in the next pandemic.

#### TRIPS alone is too ambiguous to serve as a sufficient legal standard
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3. Definitional Ambiguities & Ambiguities in Scope

Ambiguities in the interpretation of TRIPS due to the lack of substantive guidelines or definitions also hinder its effective use by **increasing the risk of litigation.**111 The Doha Declaration merely stated that individual countries have “the right to determine what constitutes a national emergency or other circumstances of extreme urgency” in deciding to grant a compulsory license, and thus did little to ameliorate the different interpretive approaches of developed and developing countries.112 **The flexible scope** of compulsory licenses **lends to abuse which further instills resistance and suspicion** from pharmaceutical companies.113 For example, Egypt’s compulsory license for Pfizer’s Viagra tarnishes the reputation of compulsory licensing because erectile dysfunction is clearly a less dire situation and one likely not intended to be covered by the public health exception of TRIPS.114 Such excessive abuse and over-use of compulsory licensing likely encourages pharmaceutical companies to aggressively resist valid uses of compulsory licenses to prevent **over-expansion of scope.**

115 In addition to ambiguity in the scope of intended diseases, conflicting interpretations exist in the type of pharmaceutical products intended for compulsory licensing.116 The scope of countries that should benefit from compulsory licensing remains another area of contention.117 Not limiting the scope of applicable nations may create a **chilling effect** on the types of drugs pharmaceutical companies choose to invest in and develop to avoid the potential for a compulsory license, **which hurts developing nations most in need of help.**118 Interpreting the morality exclusion in Article 27(2) also proves difficult, as **there is no universally accepted definition.**119 In addition to causing differing interpretations between countries, the lack of concrete definitions allows countries to alter their position to fit their self-interest and creates potential for abuse.120 For example, despite the United States’ narrow interpretation of TRIPS flexibilities, the United States contradicted itself during the 2001 anthrax scare by suggesting use of a compulsory license for Cipro, a drug that combats the effects of anthrax.121 On a related note, as India’s government and pharmaceutical industry’s capabilities grow, the future of India’s willingness to grant compulsory licenses and produce cheap generic drugs for export to other developing countries is questionable.122 Indian companies may opt to serve their selfinterest and become “innovator companies” to compete globally with other large pharmaceutical companies.123 The vagueness of Article 30, which allowed a narrow interpretation to be given by the WTO dispute resolution panel, is a further impediment to increasing access to medicines.124 Calculating adequate remuneration for payment to the patent holder when a compulsory license is issued is another obstacle to successful use of TRIPS flexibilities and is further complicated by the requirement to take the economic value of the authorization into account, as TRIPS does not provide guidance to determine what is ‘adequate’ and what is the authorization’s ‘value.’125 The WTO members’ inability to reach a decision regarding parallel importation created a “fundamental flaw” of ambiguity.126 In regard to compulsory licensing under the Paragraph 6 Decision, drugs made for export must be distinguishable by special labels, colors, or shapes to prevent trade diversion.127 However, lack of monitoring guidelines and repercussions makes the re-exportation issue troubling.128