## 1

#### Permissibility and presumption negate – a] the resolution indicates the aff has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### b] Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false

#### c] real world policies require proactive justification to be passed – outweighs since that determines portable impacts

#### d] don’t believe your name plus no reason to be skeptical

#### Ethics must begin a posteriori and the meta-ethic is naturalism.

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

#### Thus the standard is act hedonistic util. Prefer –

#### 1] Pleasure is an intrinsic desire—solves regress.

Moen ’16 – (Ole Martin, PhD, Research Fellow in Philosophy @ University of Oslo, "An Argument for Hedonism." Journal of Value Inquiry 50.2 (2016): 267). Modified for glang

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative. 2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good. 3 As Aristotle observes: “We never ask what her~~is~~ end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value. Although pleasure and pain thus seem to be good candidates for intrinsic value and disvalue, several objections have been raised against this suggestion: (1) that pleasure and pain have instrumental but not intrinsic value/disvalue; (2) that pleasure and pain gain their value/disvalue derivatively, in virtue of satisfying/frustrating our desires; (3) that there is a subset of pleasures that are not intrinsically valuable (so-called “evil pleasures”) and a subset of pains that are not intrinsically disvaluable (so-called “noble pains”), and (4) that pain asymbolia, masochism, and practices such as wiggling a loose tooth render it implausible that pain is intrinsically disvaluable. I shall argue that these objections fail.

#### 2] Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations—takes out calc indicts since they are empirically denied.

#### [a] Governments must aggregate since every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### [b] No act-omission distinction—governments are responsible for everything in the public sphere so inaction is implicit authorization of action: they have to yes/no bills, which means everything collapse to aggregation.

#### [c] No intent-foresight distinction – the actions we take are inevitably informed by predictions from certain mental states, meaning consequences are a collective part of the will.

#### 3] No calc indicts – a] no philosophy actually says that consequences don’t matter at all since otherwise it would indict every theory since they use causal events for ethics

#### b] empirically denied- govs calculate all the time

#### 4] Extinction outweighs under any framework

MacAskill 14 [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.

#### 5] Death is bad and outweighs – agents can’t act if they fear for their bodily security which constrains every ethical theory

## 2

#### The US is leading the biopharmaceuticals race – but China is close. Catching up would be a death sentence for US lead.

Gupta 21 [Gaurav; Physician, founder of the biotechnology investment firm Ascendant BioCapital; “As Washington Ties Pharma’s Hands, China Is Leaping Ahead,” Barrons; 6/11/21; <https://www.barrons.com/articles/as-washington-ties-pharmas-hands-china-is-leaping-ahead-51623438808>] Justin

There should be no doubt that we are living at the dawn of a golden age of biomedical innovation. The American scientific engine that produced Covid-19 vaccines in record time was fueled by a convergence of advances in genomics, biomarkers, data science, and manufacturing years in the making. The first Food and Drug Administration approvals of a host of new product formats—oligonucleotide, bispecific, oncolytic virus, CAR-T, and lentivirus/AAV—all took place within the last decade. These represent an unprecedented expansion of the armamentarium that physicians have at their disposal to treat and cure disease. In the last few years, 47% of all new medicines were invented by U.S. biopharma companies, with homegrown startups driving the majority of innovation. The bulk of the remainder were developed by foreign companies specifically for the U.S. market.

An indirect benefit of these trends is that most novel therapeutics undergo clinical development and early commercial launch here in the U.S. The rest of the world understands that the American patient has earlier and broader access to groundbreaking therapies via these mechanisms. Indeed, the past decade is filled with examples of medical “firsts” for American patients: the first cure for Hepatitis C, the first gene therapy for blindness, the first immunotherapy for cancer. Future rewards will be greater still if we preserve our current system of incentivizing and protecting innovation.

The remarkable innovation capacity of our biopharmaceutical industry ought to be a source of national pride. Yet while “Made in America” is the global standard for medicines in development today, misguided policy risks ceding our scientific prowess to other countries in the future. This is particularly true in the case of China, where biotechnology has become a strategic pillar for the health of its people and economy.

From 2016 to 2020, the market capitalization of all Chinese biopharma companies increased exponentially from $1 billion to over $200 billion. China saw over $28 billion invested in its life sciences sector in 2020, double the previous year’s amount. Returns on China’s investment are already arriving. The FDA approved a drug developed in China for the first time ever in 2019. While China’s innovation capacity currently remains behind America’s, my experiences as a biopharma professional make it clear they are doing everything they can to catch up and catch up fast.

In fact, when I speak to Chinese biotechnology executives, they boast that they can run clinical trials faster than their U.S. counterparts. The danger of misguided policies that disincentivize pharmaceutical innovation in the U.S. is effectively driving that same innovation to China. If we close off the market in the U.S. at the same time that China is opening its market to innovative new products, then we will see companies choose to first launch impactful novel medicines in China, based on clinical trials conducted in China. Because the FDA rarely accepts data generated entirely outside the U.S., this relocation of research capacity will negatively affect Americans’ access to cutting-edge therapies.

#### The plan gives away sensitive biotechnology information that facilitates a China lead.

Rogin 21 [Josh; Columnist for the Global Opinions section of the Washington Post and a political analyst with CNN. Previously, he has covered foreign policy and national security for Bloomberg View, Newsweek, the Daily Beast, Foreign Policy magazine, Congressional Quarterly, Federal Computer Week magazine and Japan’s Asahi Shimbun newspaper. He was a 2011 finalist for the Livingston Award for Young Journalists and the 2011 recipient of the Interaction Award for Excellence in International Reporting. Rogin holds a BA in international affairs from George Washington University and studied at Sophia University in Tokyo. He lives in Washington, DC; “Opinion: The wrong way to fight vaccine nationalism,” The Washington Post; 4/8/21; <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/global-opinions/the-wrong-way-to-fight-vaccine-nationalism/2021/04/08/9a65e15e-98a8-11eb-962b-78c1d8228819_story.html>] Justin

Americans will not be safe from covid-19 until the entire world is safe. That basic truth shows why vaccine nationalism is not only immoral but also counterproductive. But the simplest solutions are rarely the correct ones, and some countries are using the issue to advance their own strategic interests. The Biden administration must reject the effort by some nations to turn our shared crisis into their opportunity.

As the inequities of vaccine distribution worldwide grow, a group of more than 50 developing countries led by India and South Africa is pushing the World Trade Organization to dissolve all international intellectual property protections for pandemic-related products, which would include vaccine research patents, manufacturing designs and technological know-how. The Trump administration rejected the proposal to waive the agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) for the pandemic when it was introduced in October.

Now, hundreds of nongovernmental organizations and dozens of Democratic lawmakers are pushing the Biden administration to support the proposal. But many warn the move would result in the United States handing over a generation of advanced research — much of it funded by the U.S. taxpayer — to our country’s greatest competitors, above all China.

In Congress, there’s justified frustration with the United States’ failure to respond to China’s robust vaccine diplomacy, in which Beijing has conditioned vaccine offers to pandemic-stricken countries on their ignoring security concerns over Chinese telecom companies or abandoning diplomatic recognition of Taiwan. There’s also a lot of anger at Big Pharma among progressives for profiting from the pandemic.

“We are in a race against time, and unfortunately Big Pharma is standing in the way of speedily addressing this problem,” Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-Ill.), who supports the effort to waive intellectual property protections, told me in an interview. “I think the real security issue is that while the United States balks in making sure that we help ourselves, that these adversaries will just jump right in.”

Schakowsky argued that alternative measures for helping poor countries manufacture vaccines are simply not moving fast enough to save lives and that the United States has a duty to respond. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) personally conveyed her support for the waiver to President Biden, Schakowsky said.

But Big Pharma is just one piece of the puzzle. Countries such as India and South Africa have been trying to weaken WTO intellectual property protections for decades. The mRNA technology that underpins the Pfizer and Moderna vaccines was funded initially by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and has national security implications.

Inside the Biden administration, the National Security Council has already convened several meetings on the issue. The waiver is supported by many global health officials in the White House and at the U.S. Agency for International Development, who believe the United States’ international reputation is suffering from its perceived “America First” vaccine strategy.

On Wednesday, U.S. Trade Representative Katherine Tai spoke with WTO Director General Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala about the waiver issue. USTR is convening its own interagency meetings on the issue, which many see as a move to reassert its jurisdiction over WTO matters.

If and when this does get to Biden’s desk, he will also hear from national security officials who believe that waiving TRIPS would result in the forced transfer of national security-sensitive technology to China, a country that strives to dominate the biotechnology field as part of its Made in China 2025 strategy. Once countries such as China have this technology, they will apply their mercantilist industrial models to ensure their companies dominate these strategically important industries, potentially erasing thousands of U.S. jobs.

“We would be delivering a competitive advantage to countries that are increasingly viewed as our adversaries, at taxpayer expense, when there are other ways of doing this,” said Mark Cohen, senior fellow at the University of California at Berkeley Law School.

#### Gains are directly converted to military prowess – destroys US primacy.

Kuo 17 [Mercy A; Executive Vice President at Pamir Consulting; “The Great US-China Biotechnology and Artificial Intelligence Race,” The Diplomat; 8/23/17; <https://thediplomat.com/2017/08/the-great-us-china-biotechnology-and-artificial-intelligence-race/>] TDI // Re-Cut Justin

Trans-Pacific View author Mercy Kuo regularly engages subject-matter experts, policy practitioners, and strategic thinkers across the globe for their diverse insights into the U.S. Asia policy. This conversation with Eleonore Pauwels – Director of Biology Collectives and Senior Program Associate, Science and Technology Innovation Program at the Wilson Center in Washington D.C. – is the 104th in “The Trans-Pacific View Insight Series.”

Explain the motivation behind Chinese investment in U.S. genomics and artificial intelligence (AI).

With large public and private investments inland and in the U.S., China plans to become the next AI-Genomics powerhouse, which indicates that these technologies will soon converge in China.

China’s ambition is to lead the global market for precision medicine, **which necessitates acquiring strategic tech**nological and human capital in both genomics and AI. And the country excels at this game. A sharp blow in this U.S.-China competition happened in 2013 when BGI purchased Complete Genomics, in California, with the intent to build its own advanced genomic sequencing machines, therefore securing a technological knowhow mainly mastered by U.S. producers.

There are significant economic incentives behind China’s heavy investment in the increasing convergence of AI and genomics. This golden combination will drive precision medicine to new heights by developing a more sophisticated understanding of how our genomes function, leading to precise, even personalized, cancer therapeutics and preventive diagnostics, such as liquid biopsies. By one estimate, the liquid biopsy market is expected to be worth $40 billion in 2017.

Assess the implications of iCarbonX of Shenzhen’s decision to invest US$100 million in U.S.-company PatientsLikeMe relative to AI and genomic data collection.

iCarbonX is a pioneer in AI software that learns to recognize useful relationships between large amounts of individuals’ biological, medical, behavioral and psychological data. Such a data-ecosystem will deliver insights into how an individual’s genome is mutating over time, and therefore critical information about this individual’s susceptibilities to rare, chronic and mental illnesses. In 2017, iCarbonX invested $100 million in PatientsLikeMe, getting a hold over data from the biggest online network of patients with rare and chronic diseases. If successful, this effort could turn into genetic gold, making iCarbonX one of the wealthiest healthcare companies in China and beyond.

The risk factor is that iCarbonX is handling more than personal data, but potentially vulnerable data as the company uses a smartphone application, Meum, for customers to consult for health advice. Remember that the Chinese nascent genomics and AI industry relies on cloud computing for genomics data-storage and exchange, creating, in its wake, new vulnerabilities associated with any internet-based technology. This phenomenon has severe implications. How much consideration has been given to privacy and the evolving notion of personal data in this AI-powered health economy? And is our cyberinfrastructure ready to protect such trove of personal health data from hackers and industrial espionage? In this new race, will China and the U.S. have to constantly accelerate their rate of cyber and bio-innovation to be more resilient? Refining our models of genomics data protection will become a critical biosecurity issue.

Why is Chinese access to U.S. genomic data a national security concern?

**Genomics** and computing research **is inherently dual-use, therefore a strategic advantage in a nation’s security arsenal.**

Using AI systems to understand how the functioning of our genomes impacts our health **is of strategic importance for biodefense.** This knowledge will lead to increasing developments at the forefront of medical countermeasures, **including vaccines**, antibiotics, and targeted treatments relying on virus-engineering and microbiome research. Applying deep learning to genomics data-sets could help geneticists learn how to use genome-editing (CRISPR) to efficiently engineer living systems, but also to treat and, even “optimize,” human health, **with potential applications in military enhancements**. A $15 million partnership between a U.S. company, Gingko Bioworks, and DARPA aims to genetically design new probiotics as a protection for soldiers against a variety of stomach bugs and illnesses.

China could be using the same deep learning techniques on U.S. genomics data to better comprehend how to develop, patent and manufacture tailored cancer immunotherapies in high demand in the United States. Yet, what if Chinese efforts venture into understanding how to impact key genomics health determinants relevant to the U.S. population? **Gaining access to increasingly large U.S. genomic data-sets gives China a knowledge advantage into leading the next steps in bio-military research.**

Could biomedical data be used to develop bioweapons? Explain.

Personalized medicine advances mean that personalized bio-attacks are increasingly possible. The combination of AI with biomedical data and genome-editing technologies will help us predict genes most important to particular functions. Such insights will contribute to knowing how a particular disease occurs, how a newly-discovered virus has high transmissibility, but also why certain populations and individuals are more susceptible to it. Combining host susceptibility information with pathogenic targeted design, **malicious actors could engineer pathogens that are tailored to overcome the immune system or the microbiome of specific populations.**

#### That causes extinction.

Yulis 17 [Max; Major in PoliSci, Penn Political Review; “In Defense of Liberal Internationalism,” Penn Political Review; 4/8/17; <http://pennpoliticalreview.org/2017/04/in-defense-of-liberal-internationalism/>] // Re-Cut Justin

Over the past decade, international headlines have been bombarded with stories about the unraveling of the post-Cold War world order, the creation of revolutionary smart devices and military technologies, the rise of militant jihadist organizations, and nuclear proliferation. Indeed, times are paradoxically promising and alarming. In relation to treating the world’s ills, fortunately, there is a capable hegemon– one that has the ability to revive the world order and traditionally hallmarked human rights, peace, and democracy. The United States, with all of its shortcomings, had crafted an international agenda that significantly impacted the post-WWII landscape. Countries invested their ambitions into security communities, international institutions, and international law in an effort to mitigate the chances of a nuclear catastrophe or another World War. The horrors and atrocities of the two Great Wars had traumatized the global community, which spurred calls for peace and the creation of a universalist agenda. Today, the world’s fickle and declining hegemon still has the ability, but not the will, to uphold the world order that it had so carefully and eagerly helped construct. Now, the stakes are too high, and there must be a mighty and willing global leader to lead the effort of diffusing democratic ideals and reinforcing stability through both military and diplomatic means. To do this, the United States must abandon its insurgent wave of isolationism and protectionism, and come to grips with the newly transnational nature of problems ranging from climate change to international terrorism.

First, the increase in intra-state conflict should warrant concern as many countries, namely in Africa and the Middle East, are seeing the total collapse of civil society and government. These power vacuums are being filled with increasingly ideological and dangerous tribal and non-state actors, such as Boko Haram, ISIS, and Al-Shabaab. Other bloody civil wars in Rwanda, Sudan, and the Congo have contributed to the deaths of millions in the past two decades. As the West has seen, however, military intervention has not been all that successful in building and empowering democratic institutions in the Far East. A civil crusade, along with the strengthening of international institutions, may in fact be the answer to undoing tribal, religious, and sectarian divisions, thereby mitigating the prospects of civil conflict. During the Wilsonian era, missionaries did their part to internationalize the concept of higher education, which has contributed to the growth of universities in formerly underdeveloped countries such as China and South Korea.[1] In addition, the teachings of missionaries emphasized the universality of humanity and the oneness of man, which was antithetical to the justifications for imperialism and the rampant sectarianism that plagued much of the Middle East and Africa.[2] Seeing that an increase in the magnitude of human casualty is becoming more of a reality due to advancements in military technology and the increasing outbreaks of civil war, international cooperation and the diffusion of norms that highlight the importance of stable governance, democracy, and human rights is the only recourse to address the rise in sectarian divides and civil conflicts. So long as the trend of the West’s desire to look inward continues, it is likely that nation states mired in conflict will devolve into ethnic or tribal enclaves bent on relying on war to maintain their legitimacy and power. Aside from growing sectarianism and the increasing prevalence of failed states, an even more daunting threat come from weapons that transcend the costs of conventional warfare.

The problem of nuclear proliferation has been around for decades, and on the eve of President Trump’s inauguration, it appeared that Obama’s lofty goal of advocating for nonproliferation would no longer be a priority of American foreign policy.[3] In addition, now that the American president is threatening to undo much of the United States’ extensive network of alliances, formerly non-nuclear states may be forced to rearm themselves. Disarmament is central to liberal internationalism, as was apparent by the Washington Naval Treaty advocated by Wilson, and by the modern CTBT treaty. The reverse is, however, being seen in the modern era, with cries coming from Japan and South Korea to remobilize and begin their own nuclear weapon programs.[4] A world with more nuclear actors is a formula for chaos, especially if nuclear weapons become mass-produced. Non-state actors will increasingly eye these nuclear sites as was the case near a Belgian nuclear power plant just over a year ago.[5] If any government commits a serious misstep, access to nuclear weapons on the behalf of terrorist and insurgent groups will become a reality, especially if a civil war occurs. States with nuclear weapons require domestic stability and strong security, which is why states such as Israel, North Korea, and Pakistan could be in serious trouble in the event of a domestic uprising or military coup. The disarmament of all states is essential for human survival, and if it is not achieved, then a world full of nuclear weapons and an international system guided by realpolitik could give rise to nuclear warfare. In today’s world, nuclear weapons leave all states virtually defenseless. But, for nuclear deproliferation to become a cornerstone of the global agenda, a pacifying and democratic power must rise to the limelight to advocate the virtues of peace, stability, and human rights.

## 3

#### Text: A nation appointed international panel of scientists including National Academies and corresponding organizations should [reduce intellectual property protections] and manage similar conflicts of interest between intellectual property.

* Solves case and is offense under their framework- forces intercommunial relationships and the fostering of ethical decisions among scientists

#### International panel of science diplomats can rule over IP---that’s key to science diplomacy.

Hajjar and Greenbaum 18 [David; Dean Emeritus and University Distinguished Professor, and Professor of Biochemistry and Pathology at Weill Cornell Medicine, Cornell University. He is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences, a Jefferson Science Fellow of the National Academies at the U.S. Department of State, and a recent Senior Fellow in Science Policy at the Brookings Institute; Steven; Professor and Chair of the Department of Physics and Astronomy at Hunter College of the City University of New York and a Fellow of the American Physical Society. He was a Jefferson Science Fellow of the National Academies at the U.S. Department of State; “Leveraging Diplomacy for Managing Scientific Challenges,” American Diplomacy; September 18; <https://americandiplomacy.web.unc.edu/2018/09/leveraging-diplomacy-for-managing-scientific-challenges-an-opportunity-to-navigate-the-future-of-science/>] Justin

At the global level, science diplomacy is defined as cooperation among countries in order to solve complex problems through scientific research and education (1). For example, science diplomacy plays an important role in resolving global issues related to the ecosystem (such as clean water, food safety, energy conservation, and preservation of the environment). It also addresses problems related to the healthcare industry. For example, scientists have served at the international level to forge the Middle Eastern Cancer Consortium a decade ago to facilitate better healthcare and improve cancer research in the region. Whether one considers science for diplomacy or diplomacy for science, international science collaborations benefit from allowing science diplomats (broadly defined as science envoys, science attaches, embassy fellows) to help establish positive international relationships between the U.S., Europe, Latin America, Africa or Asia, particularly when proprietary disputes arise (2, 3). These various types of science diplomats already exist; some, like embassy fellows and science envoys, have one-year appointments so their role may be limited, while attaches usually have two or three year appointments that may allow them to be more successful in long, protracted negotiations. In any event, we believe that scientists can play more of a role in advancing international scientific cooperation. A key point addressed here is how to balance security concerns against the need for free exchange of information needed for innovation and growth.

Both the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health are already engaged in supporting American science and strengthening collaborations abroad. Such efforts take advantage of international expertise, facilities, and equipment. Here, we provide a rationale for the use of diplomacy to address scientific challenges. This approach allows some scientists working as diplomats to help manage complex and potentially conflicting situations that arise between scientific communities and their governments. Such issues include managing disputes such as licensing agreements for intellectual property (IP) and providing protection of IP.

International collaborations can not only support but also accelerate the advancement of science. However, collaborations may carry risk if IP is misappropriated for other purposes. International collaborations should have a basis in strategy and specific goals (for example, drug discovery) in order to justify the use of government and/or corporate funds.

About a decade ago, a group of academics from the University of Manchester in the United Kingdom assembled the “Manchester Manifesto,” subtitled “Who Owns Science” (6). This document addressed the lack of alignment between commercial interests, intellectual rights, and credit to the researcher. In our (and commonly held) view, the groups representing these disparate values could benefit from diplomatic mediation. More recently, it has become increasing apparent that managing China as a science and technology superpower represents another challenge for the U.S. Resolution of issues such as ownership of IP, rights to reagents, or use of skilled laboratory personnel from international collaborations may require the efforts of science diplomats. There are few international offices or “guardians” to protect junior and senior scientists in corporate or academic sectors from misuse of reagents or piracy.

China’s failure to respect IP rights, and the resulting piracy, has drawn much attention. The media have also focused on the failure of watchdog government agencies to detect and manage these unwanted activities. Industrial espionage compromises U.S. interests. Moreover, Chinese and Russian hackers have cyberattacked U.S. technology companies, financial institutions, media groups, and defense contractors. In 2018, industrial spying was even reported in a major medical school in New York City where scientists were alleged to have illegally shared research findings with Chinese companies.

The U.S. has a long history of hiring research personnel from other countries to staff its laboratories and industrial R&D centers. These scientists and engineers have made critical contributions to our nation’s well-being and security. These young Chinese and South Asian graduates of U.S. programs a generation ago now staff our research enterprise. However, recent trends in U.S. graduate school applications in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) reflect a downturn in foreign applicants, particularly from China. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the number of American-born students seeking STEM degrees is not sufficient to satisfy future demands of our high-tech workforce. While our own educational reforms must be augmented, we cannot ignore the need to continue to recruit overseas talent.

We believe that foreign scientists can continue to make critical discoveries in the U. S. provided that their talent is nurtured, developed, and harnessed for the common good. At the same time, American companies cannot hire foreign scientists if they take the ideas they generate in U.S. laboratories back to their home countries without proper credit or permission. If the advancement of science is to succeed, greater diplomatic cooperation is needed to solve and manage proprietary issues for the benefit of all (5, 6).

So, how does one strike the proper balance between security and growth? Science is a universal social enterprise; international conferences lead to friendships and productive collaborations between nations. Given that the U.S. and Chinese governments recognize the need for international communication and collaboration then surely there should be a mechanism for adjudicating anticipated conflicts. One approach would be for government, industrial, and academic stakeholders to form an international panel of scientists and engineers to manage any conflicts of interest between the need to protect proprietary information crucial to a company’s competitive edge, and the need for students and young faculty members to publish their findings. Smaller scale efforts along these lines have recently given rise to unique global partnerships, such as fellowship support by major pharmaceutical companies, which aim to address these conflicts to the benefit of both parties. An added feature of such arrangements is that they often provide corporate financing for research (9). Can this corporate-academic partnership model be adapted to multinational joint R&D efforts while protecting IP? This question falls squarely within the purview of international science diplomacy, whereby science diplomats can establish rules of conduct governing joint global technology development with proper IP protection.

Despite the highly publicized and legitimate piracy allegations against China, at least some data indicates that the Chinese legal system is responding positively to worldwide pressure to honor foreign IP. A 2016 study by Love, Helmers, and Eberhardt, for example, found that between 2006 and 2011, foreign companies brought over 10 percent of patent infringement cases in China, and won over 70 percent of those cases (10). Today, “win rates” average around 80 percent, and “injunction rates,” around 98 percent (10). As Chinese scientists and engineers increasingly enter the top tier of the innovation space, their growing awareness of their own need for IP protection could be a powerful motivating force for the protection of all IP. As stated earlier, science diplomats could catalyze this progress even further by direct negotiations with those parties involved in the conflicts. An obvious flaw in this optimistic outlook is that scientists in the U.S. wield more influence with their government than scientists in China wield with theirs. And to the extent that the Chinese government could be encouraging IP theft, this must be addressed first by those international companies/firms who want to do business with the Chinese. Chinese investments, as well as tech incubators and targeted acquisitions, can enable access to U.S. technologies for commercial development. Although this conveys a level of risk to the developers, it may provide valuable opportunities for U.S. companies as well. In many respects, the extensive engagement and collaboration in innovation between the U.S. and China, often characterized by open exchanges of ideas, talent, and technologies, can be mutually beneficial in enriching and accelerating innovation in both countries.

In summary, we believe that science diplomats could help address the increasingly complex issues that arise between accelerating scientific and engineering advances, and the need to protect national security and corporate IP. We also propose that this might be accomplished by asking the National Academies to **recommend** academic, corporate, and government scientific leaders to serve on an international scientific advisory board, and for the corresponding organizations in other countries to do the same. Access to the free flow of information promotes new knowledge and innovation. A return to a more restrictive intellectual environment is not only harmful to progress, but also nearly impossible to manage in the current internet age. A good place to start would be to engage the newly appointed head of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (the Science Advisor to the President of the United States), and working groups within established organizations. These organizations include the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) or the National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine, and corresponding international organizations. What incentive is there for a busy and successful scientist to serve in such capacity? It is the same altruism that motivates us to accept assignments as journal editors, manuscript reviewers, or funding agency panelists for the advancement of science toward the greater good.

#### Solves every existential threat.

Haynes 18—research associate in the Neurobiology Department at Harvard Medical School (Trevor, “Science Diplomacy: Collaboration in a rapidly changing world,” <http://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/science-diplomacy-collaboration-rapidly-changing-world/>, dml) // Re-Cut Justin

Today’s world is extremely interconnected. Most of us take this fact for granted, but its implications cannot be overstated. The rate at which information, resources, and people are able to move from one part of the world to another continues to accelerate at an alarming rate. Undoubtedly, this development has done society immense good. In the last century, global life expectancy has doubled, the percentage of people living in extreme poverty has dropped by about 60%, and world literacy rates have increased by a similar margin. But while these statistics paint a promising picture of human civilization, human progress rests on a fragile foundation of international cooperation; the challenges presented by an interconnected world are immense. War, natural disasters, and economic collapse now exert their effects globally, creating economic and ecological disasters and mass human migrations on an unprecedented scale. And with the US pulling out of major multilateral agreements on trade, climate change mitigation, and denuclearization, you might wonder if our ability to collaborate across borders productively is really up to the task.

Global challenges require global solutions, and global solutions require collaboration between countries both big and small, rich and poor, authoritative and democratic. There are few human enterprises capable of providing continuity across these differences, and as technological solutions are becoming available to some of our most pressing issues, two in particular will be necessary to getting the job done: science and diplomacy. While science has long been utilized as a means to reach political ends—think of British explorer James Cook’s mapping of unexplored continents or the United States’ Manhattan Project—a more formal integration of scientists into the diplomatic process is being undertaken. This effort, which has led to scientists and academics playing a direct role in foreign policy development and international relations, has given birth of a new branch of diplomacy: science diplomacy.

What is science diplomacy?

As both the term and concept of science diplomacy have only recently gained traction in scientific and diplomatic circles, it’s been given a variety of definitions. But common to them all is the focus on applying scientific expertise to an international effort. The focus of these efforts is to solve international problems collaboratively while balancing economic prosperity, environmental protection, and societal wellbeing. The challenge of reaching this balance in the face of a booming global population cannot be understated, but this new branch of diplomacy is already at work and is producing results. International agreements such as the Paris Climate Agreement and the Iran Nuclear Deal are two famous examples, and science diplomacy is also establishing international collaboration in many other important arenas. While these lesser known efforts may not dominate the headlines, they are quietly tackling the global issues of today and preparing us for those of tomorrow.

Natural disasters don’t respect national boundaries (and neither does the aftermath)

In 2013, the number of refugees displaced by natural disasters—hurricanes, droughts, earthquakes—outnumbered those displaced by war. Current projections estimate as many as 1 billion people may be displaced by natural disasters by the year 2050. That would mean 1 in 9 people on the planet displaced and looking for a home. Compare this to the estimated 12 million refugees displaced by the war in Syria, and a frightening picture begins to form. As natural disasters continue to increase in both their frequency and intensity, solutions for mitigating the risk of total catastrophe will be underpinned by science, technology, and the ability of the international community to collaborate. Many organizations are starting to tackle these problems through the use of science diplomacy. The center for Integrated Research on Disaster Risk (IRDR) is composed of ten national committees—a network of government sponsored research institutions across the world in countries ranging the political and economic scale. These working groups have committed to improving disaster-risk-reduction science and technology while providing guidance to policy makers charged with implementing disaster prevention and mitigation strategies.

IRDR is governed by a committee comprising experienced scientists and natural disaster experts. Its members come from all over the world—the US, China, Uganda, Norway, Mexico, Venezuela, and more. The diversity of this organization starts at the top and is crucial to developing comprehensive risk-reduction strategies. Data and insights from countries with varying areas of expertise are being shared and built upon, facilitating more accurate natural disaster forecasting and better strategies for mitigating their destructive power. And by including representatives from countries of varying political and economic power in its leadership, IRDR ensures that its work will consider the needs of the global community at large, rather than just nations with considerable wealth and political standing.

The results of this type of international collaboration speak for themselves. Although humanity is grappling with more natural disasters than ever before, deaths related to these incidents continue to trend downward. Operating outside of the typical political framework that dominates foreign relations, IRDR provides a model for effective collaboration across the geopolitical spectrum in the face of a major global issue.

Explore or Exploit? Managing international spaces

Over the last few decades the polar ice cap that covers much of the Arctic Ocean has been shrinking. So much so, that during the warm season vast areas of previously solid ice have become open waters, creating opportunities for new trade routes and exposing the Arctic’s enormous reserves of oil and natural gas. Depending on your values, this will sound either like an opportunity for huge economic development of the region or the inevitable exploitation of one of the last untouched natural territories on the planet. And if you live there, like the half a million indigenous people who currently do, how this territory is managed will determine where you can live, how (and if) you can make a living, and what the health of the ecosystems that have supported Arctic life for millennia will look like.

Luckily, such a scenario was predicted decades ago. In 1987, Mikhail Gorbachev, then leader of the then Soviet Union, delivered a speech outlining his aspirations for the arctic to be explored rather than exploited—to radically reduce military presence, create a collaborative multinational research effort, cooperate on matters of environmental security, and open up the Northern Sea Route for trade. This speech laid the foundation for the Arctic Council (Figure 1), which is one of the most successful examples of science diplomacy at work. Composed of the eight Arctic nations, including geopolitical rivals US and Russia, and numerous groups of indigenous peoples, the Arctic Council was established to maintain Gorbachev’s vision for the region while giving the indigenous peoples a seat at the negotiating table. The council’s activities are conducted by six scientific and technology-based working groups who conduct research in the area and provide knowledge and recommendations to the council members. As a result of this research, and allowing scientists to take part in the negotiations, the Arctic council has enacted several legally binding agreements regarding the sustainable development and environmental protection of the Arctic Ocean. These agreements have facilitated cooperation on a number of important issues including search and rescue operations, prevention and containment of maritime oil pollution, and, most recently, enhanced data sharing and scientific research collaborations. Against a backdrop of rapidly deteriorating diplomatic relations, the US and Russia have co-chaired task forces that laid the foundation for these agreements, proving to the world that meaningful results can be achieved through the avenue of science diplomacy, regardless of geopolitics.

Science diplomacy going forward

The technical expertise that characterizes science diplomacy will continue to be in demand across many realms of foreign policy. For example, synthetic biology and gene-editing technology continue to factor into matters regarding agriculture and trade. Also, digital currencies, such as bitcoin, have changed the way economists and businesses are approaching markets. Finally, machine learning and artificial intelligence are being used by governments as a means for population control, giving rise to a new type of governance—digital authoritarianism.

While this expertise will be necessary for managing such issues, building international coalitions can’t be done through a purely scientific and technical lens. Convincing others to cooperate means providing them with a convincing argument to do so, and in terms they understand and find compelling. To achieve this, scientists must be trained to communicate their expertise in a way that moves stakeholders in policy discussions to act. This means appealing to motivations they have been largely taught to put to the side—whether they be political, economic, or emotional in nature—without obscuring the data and insights they have to offer.

For our leaders, policy makers, and diplomats to effectively understand issues underpinned by science and technology, experts in these fields must continue to be integrated into the mechanisms of governance. With scientists in the US running for elections in numbers like never before, we can expect this trend to continue. And in the face of a rising wave of nationalism across the world, it is crucial that we do everything we can to foster collaboration. The future of human civilization depends on it.

## Case

#### 1] Personality Theory – IP is uniquely an extension of reason and sensibility through personal investment – Priya 08:

Priya, Kanu. "Intellectual Property and Hegelian Justification." NUJS Law Review, vol. 2008, no. 2, 2008, p. 359-366. HeinOnline. // LHP PS

**Many proponents of intellectual property law seek refuge in a personality theory of property associated with GW.F. Hegel.** This theory seems to protect intellectual property from potential attacks by a utilitarian analysis that would recognizes property only contingently insofar as it furthers society's goals of utility or wealth maximization. **Personality theory, in contrast, supposedly offers a principled argument that intellectual property right must be recognized by a just state, regardless of efficiency considerations**. Personality theory **also seems to protect intellectual property from assault by critics who maintain that it is not a form of "true" property at all.** Finally, **the theory has also been used to** support **an argument for heightened protection of intellectual property beyond that given to other forms of property - the Continental "moral" right of artists in their creations is an example**! **Hegel's view of property, with its foundation on the notion of the individual and the formation of self-identity, "is perhaps most directly applicable to the narrower notion of intellectual property."** Also characterized as the "personality theory" of property, **Hegel's rationale suggests that the inventor has imbued the invention with his personality or will, making the process of creation an intensely individualistic one.** **Hegel postulates that property and ownership are important milestones in the journey toward self-development, and are essential to survival as well.** **These are ideas that should make sense to emerging countries seeking to justify their protection of intellectual property rights.** However, this view may not successfully justify intellectual property rights in cultural systems that are less centered on the individual and more focused on the identity of the community and on the protection of community property. The individualistic underpinnings of patent law, expounded by philosophers such as Hegel, may be difficult to incorporate into more community-oriented societies.9 It has long been argued that intellectual property is justified on a number of alternative bases. Economic, labour and spiritual theories have been advanced to justify propertising intellectual creations. **Intellectual property theorists**, following Hegel's and Kant's thoughts on the subject, **contend that the personhood theory of property is especially true when the property is a work of art. They argue that works of art are created through a person's mental labor and thus embody more of her individual essence of being than works created through routine physical labor.** **Since artistic works are part of an artist's very identity, she never should be completely separated from the work. The personhood theory of intellectual property thus supports not only the idea of copyright in artistic products, but also the idea of moral rights**. The debate surrounding the correct theory about why intellectual property exists is not purely academic. It can play a decisive role in the outcome of copyright cases. For example, in Sony v. Universal City Studios (The Betamax Case) 1, the Supreme Court held the videotaping of televised programs for purposes of "time-shifting" could be considered fair use. The discussion of reputation and values shows that open-source software can embody and express personality, but it assumes a capacity for software to express personality similar to that of other copyright subject matter. This assumption requires examination, because software has unique attributes as copyrightable subject matter. Despite the differences, in terms of personality expressing capacity, the similarity is sufficiently close to conclude that the opensource approach carries and expresses personality equivalently to moral rights, even if traditional closed software does not, or perhaps cannot, because the source code is not available to be viewed. The other moral rights also fit the personality theory. The author or artist needs to control the first publication or disclosure of the work in order to ensure that when the work leaves the author's domain, it embodies the personalityview desired. Once released, the right of attribution ensures that the original author or artist retains the degree of association with the work under which the author released it. This is often done by name, but could also be under a pseudonym, or be anonymous. The right to withdraw the work upon remuneration also fits the personality theory. If the artist changes the genre or reworks the image, it may be fitting, from a moral rights perspective, for the artist to withdraw from circulation works that clash with a prior era in the artist's development. The justifications advanced for intellectual property law have been many and varied. It has been suggested that intellectual property is analogous to tangible property and justifications used to support the propertisation of physical creations can be advanced for intellectual ones as well. A common assertion used tojustify propertising **intellectual works is that intangible creations require property protection because they are economically valuable works worthy of protection in their own .** This is essentially an economic justification, one premised upon overcoming market failure and market imperfections. **Economic justification for propertising creative work is premised on the very foundation that without proper protection authors would have insufficient incentives to write new works unless they are compensated with property rights.**

#### 3] WTO rulings are not consistent with Hegelian construction of law – it’s coercive and absolutely influence rather than accounts for a countries sovereignty.

Trejo-Mathys, Jonathan (2013). *Towards a Critical Theory of the World Trade Organization: Thinking with Rawls beyond Rawls. Constellations, 20(3), 459–482.*doi:10.1111/1467-8675.12051

In the second place, there is a more systemic or functional question that touches upon the way **the political authority of the WTO impacts the normative environment of actors within the domestic legal systems of states**, i.e., firms and individuals. There is a clear process, familiar from the evolution of the EU, of ‘spillover.’ It can be visualized using the metaphor of peeling an artichoke: **Since the GATT was written, deeper layers of trade barriers have indeed been exposed, creating dozens of newer functions for the GATT/WTO system to perform.** In the 1960s and 1970s, demand grew for more elaborate rules to discipline antidumping and countervailing duty actions, voluntary restraint agreements, and government procurement. In the 1980s and 1990s, demand emerged to address many “new” issues, such as trade in services, intellectual property protection and internal investment measures. Since the Uruguay Round, the WTO has also begun addressing issues relating to environmental protection and competition policy. **In short, spillovers have increasingly generated “trade” topics that historically have been treated as internal regulatory measures** . . . from 1947 to 1979, we peeled off the outer leaves [of the artichoke], and we have now arrived at the heart of the matter— differences in national regulatory systems that have been reserved traditionally for sovereign control.72 **This implies as well that the WTO rules are moving closer to the everyday legal and political environment of local actors, whether firms or individuals, and not simply actors operating internationally on a regular basis. As this process has advanced, it seems clear that the impact of WTO rules on states and on domestic actors has increased greatly.**