# 1NC R5 Valley

## 1

### FW

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### 2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### 3] Negating is harder – A] Aff gets first and last speech which control the direction of the debate B] Affirmatives can strategically uplayer in the 1ar giving them a 7-6 time skew advantage, splitting the 2nr C] They get infinite prep time

#### 4] Affirmation theory- Affirming requires unconditionally maintaining an obligation

Affirm [is to]: maintain as true.

That’s Dictionary.com- “affirm” https://www.dictionary.com/browse/affirm

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being, or hedonistic act utilitarianism.

#### 1] Neuroscience- pleasure and pain *are* intrinsic value and disvalue – everything else regresses.

Blum et al. 18 [Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>] R.S.

**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even produce **the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### 2] 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.

#### 3] No intent-foresight distinction for states.

Enoch 07 Enoch, D [The Faculty of Law, The Hebrew Unviersity, Mount Scopus Campus, Jersusalem]. (2007). INTENDING, FORESEEING, AND THE STATE. Legal Theory, 13(02). doi:10.1017/s1352325207070048 https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/legal-theory/article/intending-foreseeing-and-the-state/76B18896B94D5490ED0512D8E8DC54B2

The general difficulty of the intending-foreseeing distinction here stemmed, you will recall, from the feeling that attempting to pick and choose among the foreseen consequences of one’s actions those one is more and those one is less responsible for looks more like the preparation of a defense than like a genuine attempt to determine what is to be done. Hiding behind the intending-foreseeing distinction seems like an attempt to evade responsibility, and so thinking about the distinction in terms of responsibility serves 39. Anderson & Pildes, supra note 38. I will use this text as my example of an expressive theory here. 40. See id. at 1554, 1564. 41. For a general critique, see Mathew D. Adler, Expressive Theories of Law: A Skeptical Overview, 148 U. PA. L. REV. 1363 (1999–2000). 42. As Adler repeatedly notes, the understanding of expression Anderson & Pildes work with is amazingly broad, so that “To express an attitude through action is to act on the reasons the attitude gives us”; Anderson & Pildes, supra note 38, at 1510. If this is so, it seems that expression drops out of the picture and everything done with it can be done directly in terms of reasons. 43. This may be true of what Anderson and Pildes have in mind when they say that “expressive norms regulate actions by regulating the acceptable justifications for doing them”; id. at 1511. http://journals.cambridge.org Downloaded: 03 Aug 2014 IP address: 134.153.184.170 Intending, Foreseeing, and the State 91 to reduce even further the plausibility of attributing to it intrinsic moral significance. This consideration—however weighty in general—seems to me very weighty when applied to state action and to the decisions of state officials. For perhaps it may be argued that individuals are not required to undertake a global perspective, one that equally takes into account all foreseen consequences of their actions. Perhaps, in other words, individuals are entitled to (roughly) settle for having a good will, and beyond that let chips fall where they may. But this is precisely what stateswomen and statesmen—and certainly states—are not entitled to settle for.44 In making policy decisions, it is precisely the global (or at least statewide, or nationwide, or something of this sort) perspective that must be undertaken. Perhaps, for instance, an individual doctor is entitled to give her patient a scarce drug without thinking about tomorrow’s patients (I say “perhaps” because I am genuinely not sure about this), but surely when a state committee tries to formulate rules for the allocation of scarce medical drugs and treatments, it cannot hide behind the intending-foreseeing distinction, arguing that if it allows45 the doctor to give the drug to today’s patient, the death of tomorrow’s patient is merely foreseen and not intended. When making a policy-decision, this is clearly unacceptable. Or think about it this way (I follow Daryl Levinson here):46 perhaps restrictions on the responsibility of individuals are justified because individuals are autonomous, because much of the value in their lives comes from personal pursuits and relationships that are possible only if their responsibility for what goes on in the (more impersonal) world is restricted. But none of this is true of states and governments. They have no special relationships and pursuits, no personal interests, no autonomous lives to lead in anything like the sense in which these ideas are plausible when applied to individuals persons. So there is no reason to restrict the responsibility of states in anything like the way the responsibility of individuals is arguably restricted.47 States and state officials have much more comprehensive responsibilities than individuals do. Hiding behind the intending-foreseeing distinction thus more clearly constitutes an evasion of responsibility in the case of the former. So the evading-responsibility worry has much more force against the intending-foreseeing distinction when applied to state action than elsewhere.

#### 4] Util is key to debates about IP.

Kar 19 [Mohit; Writer at the Original Position; “Utilitarianism in the Context of Intellectual Property,” The Original Position; 9/18/19; <https://originalpositionnluj.wordpress.com/2019/09/18/utilitarianism-in-the-context-of-intellectual-property/>] Justin

Jeremy Bentham is known as the founder of modern utilitarianism. He believed in production of the greatest possible quantity of happiness, on the part of those whose interest is in view. With regards to intellectual property, he had opined that inventors and authors should be given absolute privilege over their work, which would ensure they get remunerated duly for their work, thus leading to further creative actions being taken by them. In this article, the author will make an analysis of the utilitarian theory as proposed by Jeremy Bentham and its interplay with Intellectual Property. According to utilitarians, the main purpose of property rights is the maximization of common well-being.[i] According to Jeremy Bentham, the common well-being here mentioned is the good for the greatest number of people in a population. He defined the principle of utility as carrying an object of production of maximum happiness in a given time in a particular society.[ii] The wealth of a society consists of the cumulative wealth of each of its individual members. The most effective way to increase individual wealth is to leave the management of wealth to the individual himself, since – between the individual and the government – it is the individual who can best manage his own wealth. The society gains benefits because the increase in individual wealth is also the increase of collective wealth. Sharing this wealth is managed by the government, through taxes. Bentham argued that the value of outcome of a society is positive if the total quantity of pleasure gained by each individual under its influence is greater than the total quantity of pain.[iii] Thus, Bentham put stress on the happiness and wealth of individuals in a society. Jeremy Bentham’s utilitarianism advocates the maximization of common well-being and the proper use of resources available. To show us a practical point of view, he criticized the kind of trade strategies where a country prevents the purchase of cheaper products from another country only to protect its market. In his opinion, to pay more for a product that can be manufactured elsewhere with the same quality standards only to favor the national industry is a waste of resources.[iv] Bentham believed that trade barriers to foreign imports cannot increase trade and commerce in a particular country.[v] He termed it as a necessary evil which would give rise to monopolies and lower the quality of production.[vi] Transposing this theory to intellectual property rights, for the maximization of common welfare to be made, the legislators should strike a balance between, the monopoly of rights to stimulate creation and giving access to the population to inventions. Bentham defended the idea of ​​a limited period of protection for patents and he believed in the absolute privilege of the inventor, so that the latter can recover the amounts invested during the inventive process, while being paid for his creative activity.[vii] The right must also help the inventor since without any laws to protect him; any third party could copy his invention and thus enjoy his work without any compensation being granted. The logic to defend the monopoly stems from the fact that, without the latter, the inventor would not be encouraged to put his product or invention on the market. In this case, it would be the society that would have lost wealth which could have been added to the common well-being. In the name of enriching common well-being, Bentham stresses the importance of patents in a society and even argues that their concession should be a free service offered to inventors.[viii] The contemporary version of this theory has been presented to us by William Landes and Richard Posner in two separate works, one on copyright and the other on trademark law.[ix] Economic analysis of intellectual property rights presented by these two authors demonstrates that the protection of intellectual property may be too expensive for society and it limits the use of products. If we extrapolate a little, this contemporary utilitarian vision can assert that the products by intellectuals should be easily copied since the copies of a product do not prevent the use of the same product by several people. William Landes and Richard Posner consider the creative process as divided into two parts.[x] If we use a book as an example, its production is split between the part comprising author’s time and effort plus publishing costs, and the second part includes publication and distribution costs of the book. Generally, it is the first of these two elements that demands the most investment. The second will be more or less expensive, depending on the quantity of copies that will be produced. When the work is complete, its reproduction does not require any investment at the creative level. Hence, they stated that striking a correct balance between access and incentives is one of the central problems of copyright law.[xi] In this way, as already mentioned, the lack of remuneration of creators for the exploitation of their works may have as a consequence the diminution of the cultural wealth of a society, given that the creators will not have the desire to continue to create unless paid. It is important to note that the lack of protection conferred by copyright would not change this problem. In a society where copyright protection does not exist, a book could be easily copied without the act of copying being considered an offense. When the contemporary utilitarian vision is applied, it indicates that the benefits that they bring to a society are: It makes it easier for consumers to choose the product which has the qualities corresponding most to its needs. Since consumers already know the brand, they should not search among a whole range of products available on the market; It encourages producers to maintain good quality of their products, because consumers associate the product quality with the brand attached to it; It improves the language. Landes and Posner believe that the brands create new words that end up being incorporated in the lexicon of the language.[xii] Suppose the utilitarian theory – that of Bentham, or Posner’ and Landes’ – would be applied to intellectual property as it stands today: the benefits that would be brought to society by this analysis would be the incentive for creativity, the optimization of production and the disappearance or diminution of similar inventions made by different individuals. Among these three advantages, we can consider the incentive to creation as the most important. In this case, the monopoly guaranteed by intellectual property stimulates creation in a society and, especially with regard to patents; inventions will bring more happiness and pleasure to society in general. This justifying argument is in harmony with Bentham’s utilitarianism. The problem here is that no one really knows what kind of invention would bring more or less happiness or pleasure to the society. Moreover, the term “monopoly concession” for patents, trademarks and copyright is not based on any empirical or objective study and is rather random. Optimization of production sees ownership monopolies intellectual property as a “service” to society since data from sale indicates the products for which the company has the most need. This approach could even justify increasing the period of protection of intellectual property products. The logic here is that the decrease in the protection period or even the removal of the protection would deprive the producers of information that enables them to optimize their production. Thereby, the withdrawal or diminution of protection could even be considered harmful to society. However, if we do not impose limitations to this theory, the result could be a disparity of investments in intellectual property over investments in other areas, such as education and health, as well as in general research activities. CONCLUSION Utilitarianism, as it stands today, is intimately linked to the information obtained from the use of intellectual property monopolies. The goal is to avoid duplication of production. The problem in this case is that in a society which values ​​and encourages the production of new patents and new technologies, the plethora of patents complicates the process. This finding is based on the fact that new inventions normally rely on existing patents and the production of a new patented product will require a large number of licenses before it can begin. As Richard Posner said in his blog: ‘Patents are a source of great social costs, and only occasionally of commensurate benefits. Most firms do not actually want patents; for those firms, the costs involved in obtaining licenses from patentees are not offset by the prospect of obtaining license fees on their own patents.’

#### Outweighs – A. Most articles about IP are written through util – means other frameworks can never engage with core questions of the lit and decks predictability. B. TJFs first – substance begs the question of a framework being good for debate – fairness is a gateway issue to deciding the better debater and education is the reason schools fund debate

#### Impact calc –

#### 1] Extinction outweighs: A] Reversibility- it forecloses the alternative because we can’t improve society if we are all dead B] Structural violence- death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities C] Objectivity- body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical D] Uncertainty- if we’re unsure about which interpretation of the world is true, we should preserve the world to keep debating about it

#### 2] Calc indicts fail: A] Ethics- it would indict everything since they use events to understand how their ethics have worked B] Reciprocity- they are NIBs that create a 2:1 skew where I have to answer them to access offense while they only have to win one C] Internalism- asking why we value pain and pleasure is nonsensical cuz the answer is intrinsic since we just do, which means we still prefer hedonism despite shortcomings.

## 2

### CP

#### Text: An international panel of scientists including National Academies and corresponding organizations appointed by the member nations of the World Trade Organization should release a binding ruling to [reduce intellectual property protections for medicine].

#### They have the jurisdiction to rule over intellectual property and secure 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.
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#### Bipartisan infrastructure bill passing now but PC is needed – there is no margin for error.

Kapur et al 9/8 [Sahil, Frank Thorp, and Leigh Ann Caldwell; 9/8/21; Sahil Kapur is a national political reporter for NBC News, Frank Thorp V is a producer and off-air reporter covering Congress for NBC News, managing coverage of the Senate, Leigh Ann Caldwell is an NBC News correspondent; “*Democrats plow 'full speed ahead' on sweeping Biden budget, despite tensions*,” <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/democrats-plow-full-speed-ahead-sweeping-biden-budget-despite-tensions-n1278722>] Justin

WASHINGTON — The top two Democrats said they’re pushing forward with President Joe Biden’s sweeping safety net expansion, as House committees circulate legislative text with hearings scheduled Thursday to start advancing major sections of the bill. “We're moving full speed ahead,” Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer told reporters on a call Wednesday. The New York Democrat effectively cast aside calls by Sen. Joe Manchin, D-W.Va., for a “strategic pause” in the process of crafting the bill, as he voiced concerns about inflation and debt in a recent op-ed for the Wall Street Journal. Schumer is navigating demands by Manchin, as well as Sen. Kyrsten Sinema, D-Ariz., to reduce the price tag that Democrats set at a maximum of $3.5 trillion in the budget resolution. “There are some in my caucus who believe $3.5 trillion is too much; there are some in my caucus who believe it's too little,” Schumer said. “We're going to work very hard to have unity, because without unity, we're not going to get anything.” Speaker Nancy Pelosi said Wednesday the House is moving forward at the $3.5 trillion level. But she left open the possibility of a lower final price tag before the bill becomes law, while promising that “we will get the job done” with “a great bill” that honors Biden’s vision. “We will have our negotiations,” Pelosi, D-Calif., said, when asked by NBC News if the House could pass a bill at a lower amount. “I don’t know what the number will be. We are marking at 3.5 [trillion]. ... We will pay for more than half, maybe all of the legislation.” The remarks by Schumer and Pelosi point to a complicated balancing act, facing a broad range of opinions from centrist lawmakers skeptical of the price tag to progressives who believe $3.5 trillion should be the minimum. Democratic leaders are also juggling an aggressive timeline by seeking to ready the bill by Sept. 27 — the self-imposed House deadline to vote on the separate infrastructure bill — to ensure progressives will support the latter. They are betting Manchin can ultimately be won over on the substance of the package. Lawmakers and committees are keeping options open in case the price tag needs to be cut: For instance, they’ve privately discussed setting some provisions to expire sooner. Manchin has been somewhat vague in his demands. He has not specified what price tag he would support or what provisions of the emerging bill he wants to cut. His office did not have a comment when asked those questions Wednesday. In June, he said on ABC's "This Week" that he wants to “make sure we pay for” the bill. A source close to Manchin said he is a big proponent of targeting benefits on the basis of income and capping them so the money reaches people who need it the most — principles he believes are critical for Democrats' proposals on community college subsidies and on home-based care provisions for the disabled and elderly. Manchin also has issues with the climate change proposals in the legislation, the source said. As chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Manchin has major influence over the climate provisions. His committee was instructed to write legislation costing $198 billion for a clean electricity payment program, consumer rebates to weatherize and electrify homes, the creation of financing for domestic manufacturing of clean energy and auto supply chain technologies and climate research. “He’s not opposed to the overall bill,” the source said. “He’s going to shape the bill to what he feels is closer to the needs. People shouldn’t read into it more than that.” Senate Budget Chair Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., has said if the safety net package does not pass, the $550 billion bipartisan infrastructure package — which Manchin co-wrote — will fail as well. He told reporters the $3.5 trillion level was too low. “To my mind, this bill, that $3.5 trillion, is already the result of a major, major compromise,” Sanders said. “And at the very least, this bill should contain $3.5 trillion.” Pelosi said slashing the cost would require making difficult policy choices. “We have to talk about: What does it take? Where would you cut?” she asked. “Child care? Family medical leave paid for? Universal pre-K? Home health care?” On Thursday, the House committees on ways and means and education and labor will hold hearings on major portions of the bill they released this week. That includes 12 weeks' paid family and medical leave for all workers; expanding Medicare to cover dental, vision and hearing benefits; universal pre-K for 3- and 4-year-olds; and two years' tuition-free community college. Republicans are unified against the effort, leaving Democrats to pass the bill alone under narrow majorities. The package can bypass a Senate filibuster. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., said Wednesday that he hopes Manchin and Sinema “will dig in their heels” against some of the tax increases Democrats are eyeing to finance the package. “It comes down to — in the Senate — to two people,” he said. “Either one of them could kill the whole bill. I don't expect that to happen,” he said. “Either one of them could make dramatic changes in it — that could happen. Or either one of them could basically make a few cosmetic changes and throw in the towel.”

#### Aff doesn’t solve but requires negotiations that saps PC.

Pooley 21 [James; Former deputy director general of the United Nations’ World Intellectual Property Organization and a member of the Center for Intellectual Property Understanding; “Drawn-Out Negotiations Over Covid IP Will Blow Back on Biden,” Barron’s; 5/26/21; <https://www.barrons.com/articles/drawn-out-negotiations-over-covid-ip-will-blow-back-on-biden-51621973675>] Justin

The Biden administration recently announced its support for a proposal before the World Trade Organization that would suspend the intellectual property protections on Covid-19 vaccines as guaranteed by the landmark TRIPS Agreement, a global trade pact that took effect in 1995. The decision has sparked furious debate, with supporters arguing that the decision will speed the vaccine rollout in developing countries. The reality, however, is that even if enacted, the IP waiver will have zero short-term impact—but could inflict serious, long-term harm on global economic growth. The myopic nature of the Biden administration’s announcement cannot be overstated. Even if WTO officials decide to waive IP protections at their June meeting, it’ll simply kickstart months of legal negotiations over precisely which drug formulas and technical know-how are undeserving of IP protections. And it’s unthinkable that the Biden administration, or Congress for that matter, would actually force American companies to hand over their most cutting-edge—and closely guarded—secrets. As a result, the inevitable foot-dragging will cause enormous resentment in developing countries. And that’s the real threat of the waiver—precisely because it won’t accomplish either of its short-term goals of improving vaccine access and facilitating tech transfers from rich countries to developing ones. It’ll strengthen calls for more extreme, anti-IP measures down the road. Experts overwhelmingly agree that waiving IP protections alone won’t increase vaccine production. That’s because making a shot is far more complicated than just following a

recipe, and two of the most effective vaccines are based on cutting-edge discoveries using messenger RNA. As Moderna Chief Executive Stephane Bancel said on a recent earnings call, “This is a new technology. You cannot go hire people who know how to make the mRNA. Those people don’t exist. And then even if all those things were available, whoever wants to do mRNA vaccines will have to, you know, buy the machine, invent the manufacturing process, invent creation processes and ethical processes, and then they will have to go run a clinical trial, get the data, get the product approved and scale manufacturing. This doesn’t happen in six or 12 or 18 months.” Anthony Fauci, the president’s chief medical adviser, has echoed that sentiment and emphasized the need for immediate solutions. “Going back and forth, consuming time and lawyers in a legal argument about waivers—that is not the endgame,” he said. “People are dying around the world and we have to get vaccines into their arms in the fastest and most efficient way possible.” Those claiming the waiver poses an immediate, rather than long-term, threat to IP rights also misunderstand what the waiver will—and won’t—do. The waiver petition itself is more akin to a statement of principle than an actual legal document. In fact, it’s only a few pages long. As the Office of the United States Trade Representative has said, “Text-based negotiations at the WTO will take time given the consensus-based nature of the institution and the complexity of the issues involved.” The WTO director-general predicts negotiations will last until early December. That’s a lot of wasted time and effort. The U.S. Trade Representative would be far better off spending the next six months breaking down real trade barriers and helping export our surplus vaccine doses and vaccine ingredients to countries in need.

#### Infrastructure secures the grid against worsening and increasing cyberattacks.

Carney 21 [Chris; 8/6/21; Senior policy advisor at Nossaman LLC, former US Representative, former professor of political science at Penn State University; "*The US Senate Infrastructure Bill: Securing Our Electrical Grid Through P3s and Grants*," JDSupra, <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-us-senate-infrastructure-bill-4989100/>] Justin

As we begin to better understand the main components of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act that the US Senate is working to pass this week, it is clear that public-private partnerships ("P3s") are a favored funding mechanism of lawmakers to help offset high costs associated with major infrastructure projects in communities. And while past infrastructure bills have used P3s for more conventional projects, the current bill also calls for P3s to help pay for protecting the US electric grid from cyberattacks. Responding to the increasing number of cyberattacks on our nation’s infrastructure, and given the fragile physical condition of our electrical grid, the Senate included provisions to help state, local and tribal entities harden electrical grids for which they are responsible. Section 40121, Enhancing Grid Security Through Public-Private Partnerships, calls for not only physical protections of electrical grids, but also for enhancing cyber-resilience. This section seeks to encourage the various federal, state and local regulatory authorities, as well as industry participants to engage in a program that audits and assesses the physical security and cybersecurity of utilities, conducts threat assessments to identify and mitigate vulnerabilities, and provides cybersecurity training to utilities. Further, the section calls for strengthening supply chain security, protecting “defense critical” electrical infrastructure and buttressing against a constant barrage of cyberattacks on the grid. In determining the nature of the partnership arrangement, the size of the utility and the area served will be considered, with priority going to utilities with fewer available resources. Section 40122 compliments the previous section as it seeks to incentivize testing of cybersecurity products meant to be used in the energy sector, including SCADA systems, and to find ways to mitigate any vulnerabilities identified by the testing. Intended as a voluntary program, utilities would be offered technical assistance and databases of vulnerabilities and best practices would be created. Section 40123 incentivizes investment in advanced cybersecurity technology to strengthen the security and resiliency of grid systems through rate adjustments that would be studied and approved by the Secretary of Energy and other relevant Commissions, Councils and Associations. Lastly, Section 40124, a long sought-after package of cybersecurity grants for state, local and tribal entities is included in the bill. This section adds language that would enable state, local and tribal bodies to apply for funds to upgrade aging computer equipment and software, particularly related to utilities, as they face growing threats of ransomware, denial of service and other cyberattacks. However, under Section 40126, cybersecurity grants may be tied to meeting various security standards established by the Secretary of Homeland Security, and/or submission of a cybersecurity plan by a grant applicant that shows “maturity” in understanding the cyber threat they face and a sophisticated approach to utilizing the grant. While the final outcome of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act may still be weeks or months away, inclusion of these provisions not only demonstrates a positive step forward for the application of federal P3s and grants generally, they also show that Congress recognizes the seriousness of the cyber threats our electrical grids face. Hopefully, through judicious application of both public-private partnerships and grants, the nation can quickly secure its infrastructure from cyberattacks.

#### Cyberattacks on the grid spiral to all-out nuclear conflict.

Klare 19 [Michael; November 2019; Professor emeritus of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College; “*Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation*,” Arms Control Association, <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation>] Justin

Yet another pathway to escalation could arise from a cascading series of cyberstrikes and counterstrikes against vital national infrastructure rather than on military targets. All major powers, along with Iran and North Korea, have developed and deployed cyberweapons designed to disrupt and destroy major elements of an adversary’s key economic systems, such as power grids, financial systems, and transportation networks. As noted, Russia has infiltrated the U.S. electrical grid, and it is widely believed that the United States has done the same in Russia.12 The Pentagon has also devised a plan known as “Nitro Zeus,” intended to immobilize the entire Iranian economy and so force it to capitulate to U.S. demands or, if that approach failed, to pave the way for a crippling air and missile attack.13 The danger here is that economic attacks of this sort, if undertaken during a period of tension and crisis, could lead to an escalating series of tit-for-tat attacks against ever more vital elements of an adversary’s critical infrastructure, producing widespread chaos and harm and eventually leading one side to initiate kinetic attacks on critical military targets, risking the slippery slope to nuclear conflict. For example, a Russian cyberattack on the U.S. power grid could trigger U.S. attacks on Russian energy and financial systems, causing widespread disorder in both countries and generating an impulse for even more devastating attacks. At some point, such attacks “could lead to major conflict and possibly nuclear war.”14
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## 1NC – FW

### 1NC – AT: Prag

#### Off the meta-ethic:

#### 1] is/ought fallacy—just because people use pluralism doesn’t mean they should

#### 2] not actor-specific—individuals may be pluralistic but the only way for the government to recognize different viewpoints is to help the most amount of people

#### 3] resolvability is wrong—every framework debate ever disproves and the judge can decide based on arguments which framework is more likely true. It also links to them because there’s disagreement about whether pluralism is true

#### 4] util solves pluralism—even if there are disagreements about morality everyone thinks pleasure is good and pain is bad

#### 5] Begs the question of when we stop deliberating – their framework is useless since regressive deliberation means we never comme to actual ethical conclusions and everything is procedural rather than normative.

## 1NC – Circumvention

### 1NC – US

#### Circumvention – US proves.

Marcellin 16 Marcellin, Sherry (Professor, London School of Economics). The political economy of pharmaceutical patents: US sectional interests and the African Group at the WTO. Routledge, 2016./SJKS

In July 1988, prior to the Montreal Mid-Term Review, DCs had sensed that the approach being proposed by industrialised countries was desirable on the grounds that the alternative would be a proliferation of unilateral or bilateral actions (MTN.GNG/NG11/8: 31). These NITs maintained that acceptance of such an approach would be tantamount to creating a licence to force, in the name of trade, modifications in standards for the protection of IP in a way that had not been found acceptable or possible so far in WIPO (ibid). Brazil subsequently informed the Group that on October 20, 1988, unilateral restrictions had been applied by the US to Brazilian exports as a retaliatory measure in connection with an IP issue; that this type of action seriously inhibited Brazil’s participation in the work of the Group, since ‘no country could be expected to participate in negotiations while experiencing pressures on the substance of its position’ (MTN.GNG/NG11/10: 27). The Brazilian delegate maintained that such action by the US constituted a blatant infringement of GATT rules and was contrary to the Standstill commitment of the Punta del Este Declaration. ‘The United States action was an attempt to coerce Brazil to change its intellectual property legislation, and furthermore represented an attempt by the United States to improve its negotiating position in the Uruguay Round’ (ibid). A US delegate countered that the measures had been taken with regret and as a last resort after all alternative ways of defending legitimate US interests had been exhausted, and that the US further believed that the adoption of effective patent protection was in Brazil’s own interest (ibid: 28). The US had therefore applied its strategy of coercive unilateralism against one of the two most important players championing the cause of the South in the TRIPS negotiations, the other being India. Apprehensive about the resistance of this dominant Southern duo, the United States sought to utilise its market size as a bargaining tool to secure changes to national IP regimes. It therefore decided to impact the more powerful of the two at the time, thereby indirectly admonishing India and the entire coalition against strengthened IP rules, as well as their domestic export constituencies who would be affected by US decisions to restrict imports. Moreover, because Brazil and India appeared to be collaborating extensively in maintaining a united front, a resulting strain on Brazil’s economy would likely affect their co-operation. However, since market opening and closure have been treated as the currency of trade negotiations in the post-war period (Steinberg 2002: 347), the move to place restrictions on Brazilian exports by the largest consumer market in the GPE should not have been entirely unanticipated. Brazil was also the regional leader in South America and disciplining it would send an unequivocal warning to other South American countries (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002: 136), including Argentina, Chile and Peru who were also active participants in the negotiations. This would mark the start of a series of coercive strategies aimed at compliance with the US private-sector envisioned GATT IPP.

## 1NC – Evergreening

### 1NC – Top-level

#### Evergreening is a myth.

Lietzan 20 [Erika; Professor of Law, University of Missouri School of Law, Research interests in Pharmaceutical Regulation, Device Regulation, Intellectual Property; “The Evergreening Myth Claims that drug innovators extend their patents obscure a radical policy‐​making goal.,” Cato Institute; Fall 2020; <https://www.cato.org/regulation/fall-2020/evergreening-myth>/] Justin

In recent years, U.S. policymakers have considered proposals intended to prevent — or at least reduce — “evergreening” by pharmaceutical companies. Some proposals would change the antitrust enforcement landscape, others the intellectual property landscape, and still others the regulatory framework that governs new medicines. Some proposals — such as those creating new causes of action under the antitrust laws or limiting the availability of patents for discoveries — are profound and their proponents cite a body of academic and policy literature that decries supposed “evergreening” by companies to justify their ideas. The term “evergreening” is a metaphor, meant to remind audiences of evergreen trees, which have green foliage year‐​round. It implies that something has been extended, and users of the metaphor view this extension as improper or undesirable. When offering descriptions and examples of evergreening, they focus on drug companies continuing to innovate after first introducing a new molecule, and on the broader marketplace for medicines after subsequent innovations have been introduced to the market. But proponents are frustratingly inconsistent and unclear about what, exactly, has been “extended” in these situations. A close look at the regulatory landscape in which continuing pharmaceutical innovation occurs shows that arguments for reform are grounded in myths, such as the myth that pharmaceutical companies continuing to innovate somehow “extend” their patents. Once the myths of “evergreening” are laid bare, it becomes apparent that proponents of these proposals really want for the government to limit medical innovators to one medical product in the marketplace for each useful new molecule discovered. They are arguing that an innovator should not enjoy an exclusive market — and the resulting advantageous pricing — for innovations that, though discrete and independently satisfying the standard for a patent under U.S. law, stem in some fashion from an earlier innovation for which that innovator separately enjoyed exclusivity and the resulting pricing advantages. Or, at least, that drug innovators should not. This is a radical proposal that merits careful reflection and discussion, and it is not ripe for action. Understanding that this is the true policymaking objective requires unpacking the regulatory landscape and market more carefully, and paying closer attention to word choice, than proponents of reform often do. The Evergreening Allegation In the United States, every new medicinal product requires premarket approval from the Food and Drug Administration. The drug statute refers to approval of a “new drug,” and ambiguity in the term “drug” provides fertile ground for confusion and rhetorical mischief, as discussed later in this article. A firm that wants to market a new drug must prove to the FDA that the drug is safe and effective. Generating this information takes years, beginning with work in the laboratory and on animals, and progressing through several rounds of “clinical” testing in humans. For new molecules, the clinical portion of this research and development program averages six years. The process is also expensive: the Tufts Center for the Study of Drug Development now estimates the average cost of developing a new molecular entity at $2.6 billion. That figure includes average out‐​of‐​pocket costs of $1.4 billion and reflects the cost of unsuccessful projects. Most research and development programs fail. When new drugs are first launched by innovators, they tend to be sold under brand names and protected by patents as well as statutory rights in the data that supported FDA approval (known as “data exclusivity”). Although the pricing of these products may reflect competitive pressure from other branded products, it also reflects the fact that patent rights and statutory data exclusivity delay the launch of cheaper copies. But no more than five years later, and often earlier, the innovator’s competitors may file applications seeking approval of their own products based on the innovator’s research, rather than performing their own. They file what are known as “abbreviated applications” — abbreviated because they omit some, or all, of the research needed to prove safety and effectiveness. Abbreviated applications are much less expensive and time‐​consuming to assemble, and the competitors’ drugs correspondingly much less expensive than the original drugs they copy. When a competitor seeks to market an exact copy through an abbreviated application, we call its drug a “generic” drug. Pharmacists usually dispense generic copies even when doctors prescribe the corresponding branded products by name. Some people use the “evergreening” label when an innovator holds more than one patent protecting its product, especially if some patents expire later than others. More often, though, these people use the label when an innovator introduces a newer version of its own product that is already on the market. These newer products tend to be sold under brand names and protected by their own patents and statutory data exclusivity. Sometimes the innovator also stops selling its older product. If purchasers shift to the innovator’s newer product rather than purchasing cheap copies of the innovator’s older product, some say the innovator has engaged in evergreening. Although the term “evergreening” is a metaphor and signifies an extension of something, proponents of reform proposals do not agree on the particulars of the term’s use. Some say the company has evergreened its invention, its drug, or its product. Others say the company has evergreened the drug’s patent or patent life, or its exclusivity. Some say it has extended the drug’s patents, or the drug’s patent coverage or patent life, or the drug’s exclusivity period. Some say the company has evergreened the drug’s price, or its own profits or monopoly, or the company has extended its market power. Many argue that through evergreening — whatever the term means — the innovator has improperly blocked other firms from competing with it. On this basis, they seek government intervention. For instance, one recent proposal would allow the Federal Trade Commission to bring antitrust actions against innovators who introduced newer products to replace their older products. Three Myths of Evergreening The circumstances that trigger the “evergreening” label occur at the intersection of several complex bodies of law: the federal framework requiring premarket approval of new medicines and their copies, federal intellectual property laws, federal and state laws governing promotion of medicines, and federal laws and practices and state laws relating to prescribing and dispensing medicines. Many who propose aggressive government intervention because of evergreening give short shrift to this landscape, which allows the perpetuation of three myths that distort policymaking discussions. Before reviewing the myths, it will help to understand two points about the framework in which innovators compete with the companies that submit abbreviated applications. First, the FDA approves products, not active ingredients. And second, patents protect inventions, not products. Federal law states that every “new drug” requires an approved application. But at the FDA the term “drug” has more than one meaning. It includes a medicine’s active ingredient, to be sure. But it also includes drug products. A drug product is a medicine in its finished form, meaning the form that will be sold in the market and administered to patients. And the FDA approves a particular product described in a particular application — the specific combination of active and inactive ingredients (often called a drug’s “formulation”), in a particular dosage form (such as capsule or tablet), for a particular route of administration (such as oral or topical), at a particular strength, for particular medical uses (also known as the product’s “indications”), manufactured as described in the application, and accompanied by labeling written for prescribers based on the data in the application. Federal law allows a patent to issue for any new, useful, non‐​obvious invention, including a process, a composition of matter, and an improvement to an existing process or composition of matter. The patent usually expires 20 years after its application date. For any particular drug product approved by the FDA, the innovator might own patents on various types of inventions. The innovator usually owns a patent claiming the product’s active ingredient, and because the innovator generally files this patent before starting clinical trials, it is usually the first to expire. Other inventions protected by patent might include the product’s formulation or a dosage form and dosage of the active ingredient (or formulation). These inventions may emerge later in the premarket development process. If the resulting patent applications refer to the active ingredient patent, the patents will expire when the active ingredient patent expires, but otherwise they will expire later. The innovator may also own other patents claiming inventions embodied in the product, such as a patent claiming methods of using or administering the product, a patent claiming the manufacturing process, or a patent claiming a metabolite of the active ingredient. These, too, could expire later than the first patent — sometimes much later. These two points work together. A single active ingredient associated with a single brand name might be the subject of a half dozen, dozen, or more discrete products. Suppose an active ingredient was formulated into tablets and the innovator sold six strengths. Suppose the innovator also formulated an injectable version, which it sold in two strengths. Suppose it also developed a disintegrating tablet for oral administration, which it sold in four strengths. This innovator would sell 12 discrete products with the same active ingredient and probably (though not necessarily) the same brand name. And because a single product might incorporate many discrete inventions, the patents relevant to one product might differ from the patents relevant to another. Failure to realize this — and its regulatory significance — leads to three myths, as follows. Myth of evergreening patents / The first myth is that innovators extend their patents. This is legally impossible. In the United States, a patent expires 20 years after its application date. There are only two ways a patent’s expiration date can shift later in time: (1) When it issues a patent, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) adjusts the expiry date later to compensate for routine delays at the PTO. And (2), if the marketing application proposed a new active ingredient, then if the company asks the PTO for a patent term extension within 60 days of FDA approval, the PTO will use a statutory formula to extend one patent claiming the product to compensate partially for the lapse of patent life during premarket testing and regulatory review. There is no other mechanism by which a patent might be extended. In particular, a patent on one invention — no matter when it expires — does not extend the patent on another invention. Myth of blocked competitors / The second myth is that when an innovator holds patents that expire after its active ingredient patent, or when it introduces newer products to market, it can prevent its competitors from bringing their copies to market. Instead, once the initial patent and (if applicable) statutory exclusivity on the innovator’s active ingredient have expired, its competitors have substantial freedom to operate. This freedom reflects two facts that are often overlooked. First, the innovator’s competitor does not have to propose an exact copy. Federal law permits the competitor to rely on the innovator’s research but propose competing products that are not identical. To be sure, a competitor may submit an ANDA for a product that essentially duplicates the innovator’s product — that is, a generic. Ordinarily, the company shows in the ANDA that its product has the same active ingredient, route of administration, dosage form, strength, and labeling as the innovator’s product. The generic must also be “bioequivalent” to the original drug that it references, meaning that its active ingredient must reach the site of action in the body to the same extent and at the same rate as the active ingredient of the referenced product. But even a generic can be a little different. For example, it usually does not need the same inactive ingredients in the same quantities. And the generic competitor need not use the same manufacturing process. If a competitor wants to offer a different route of administration, dosage form, or strength — for instance, to avoid infringing a patent — it may still be able to use the generic drug approval pathway. It simply files a “suitability petition” asking the FDA’s permission. The agency will approve the petition unless more data are needed to establish the proposed product’s safety and effectiveness. And at this point, the competitor may file an ANDA. More significantly, though, a competitor can always use a different abbreviated application pathway: a “505(b)(2)” application for a product that differs more substantially from the innovator’s product. Although the changes proposed in this hybrid application must be supported by new data, the competitor otherwise relies on the innovator’s data, avoiding the expensive and time‐​consuming research and development process the innovator went through. In addition to using this mechanism to propose modifications that avoid a patent, a competitor might use the mechanism to propose innovations that will offer an advantage in the market — such as changes to the active ingredient and new medical uses. Second, an abbreviated application cites a specific innovative product, not the active ingredient or brand writ large. The competitor selects one innovative product as the reference product on which it relies — for instance, one of the 12 products in the hypothetical above. Its regulatory burden is tied to that specific product alone. The requirement to show sameness and bioequivalence (for an ANDA) and, critically, the obligation to contend with patents and wait for statutory exclusivity to expire are linked to the one specific product, alone. (In rare circumstances, when filing a hybrid application, a competitor might cite two innovative products, but the same point applies.) To be sure, the patents associated with the cited innovative product affect when the FDA may approve the abbreviated application. Whether it files an ANDA or a hybrid application, a competitor must address the unexpired patents listed in the FDA’s “Orange Book” for the specific innovative product it has chosen to cite. For each listed patent, it has two choices, and its selection dictates the timing of FDA approval as far as that patent is concerned. The competitor may state the date on which the patent will expire, signaling that it does not plan to market its product until expiry. This precludes final approval of its product until patent expiry. Or it may assert that the patent is invalid or will not be infringed by its product, notifying the innovator of this position. If the innovator sues within 45 days, the drug statute stays final approval of its abbreviated application for 30 months. Under changes to the law made in 2003, though, unless the competitor changes its position on a patent after filing its abbreviated application, approval of its application is stayed only once. At the end of the 30 months, the FDA must approve the abbreviated application if the approval standard is met, even if there is ongoing patent litigation. Although a competitor using the abbreviated application pathway must contend with the innovator’s patents and approval of its product may be delayed because of those patents, this is true of only the patents associated with the specific product that it references. The competitor does not have to contend with patents associated with other products that happen to contain the same active ingredient or bear the same brand name. Similarly, the competing applicant grapples with only the statutory exclusivity associated with the product it references. The drug statute provides five years of exclusivity in the data supporting new chemical entities and three years of exclusivity for most new products that are not new chemical entities. Separately, if an innovator introduces what the FDA calls a new “condition of approval” — such as a new strength or dosage form — the drug statute may provide three years of exclusivity. This delays approval of abbreviated applications proposing products with the same active ingredient for the same condition of approval. But a competitor that proposed a different strength or dosage form — or that cited a product with a different strength or dosage form (such as the innovator’s original product) — would not need to grapple with that exclusivity. This debunks the myth that an innovator with later‐​expiring patents and an innovator that introduces newer products can prevent its competitors from bringing copies to market. Instead, competitors have several options. For instance, empirical studies show that competitors file abbreviated applications as early as the law permits them to do so, arguing that the innovator’s patents are invalid or, if applicable, not infringed by the new drug. They tend to lose these arguments when the active ingredient patent is at issue, but they tend to win if a formulation patent is at issue. If a competitor believed it would infringe a patent or feared it would lose the patent infringement suit brought by the innovator, it could seek a license. Settlements of patent litigation between innovators and competitors seeking to market generic copies usually include a license allowing the competitor to bring its product to market earlier than the date of patent expiry. There are also other options. Once the patent on the active ingredient expires, a competitor can use the ingredient in its own product and file an abbreviated application, relying on the research performed and submitted by the innovator. Even in an ANDA, a true generic application, only the active ingredient must be the same. A competitor may be able to design around patents claiming other aspects of the innovator’s product (such as its strength and route of administration) and still file a true generic application. The competitor would simply file a suitability petition and, upon approval of that petition, a generic application proposing the difference that allowed it to avoid patent infringement. Then it would assert non‐​infringement in its application. If it could not file a generic application (for instance, because the FDA requested data to support the changes made), it could always file a hybrid application. It would still rely on the innovator’s research and it would similarly assert non‐​infringement in its application. In either case, the innovator might not sue if the competitor clearly avoided its patents. It is thus misleading for advocates of intervention to complain about the number of “patents” associated with a “drug.” A competitor filing an abbreviated application does not copy a “drug” in the broad sense of the term. Accurately describing a company’s freedom to operate in the market would require focusing on discrete products that can serve as references for abbreviated applications and on the number, scope, and breadth of the patent claims held by the innovator for those products. This would tell policymakers more about the market effects of a firm’s innovation and patenting practices than the number of patents associated with a particular brand name or the number of patents associated with the many finished products containing a particular active ingredient. Myth that automatic substitution is critical / The final myth of evergreening is that continuing innovation — especially when an innovator introduces a newer version of its product and stops selling its old version — precludes uptake of less expensive medicines by interfering with automatic pharmacy substitution under state pharmacy law. This myth reflects an assumption that competitors who file abbreviated applications depend on automatic pharmacy substitution — rather than the ordinary rough and tumble of a competitive marketplace — to obtain market share. The truth may be more complicated. Automatic pharmacy substitution arises through a combination of longstanding FDA practices and state pharmacy law. Once the agency has approved two products with the same active ingredient, it assesses whether they are “therapeutically equivalent.” Designating two as therapeutically equivalent means that they have the same clinical profile and that they can be “substituted”: either can be dispensed instead of the other. A true generic drug, an exact copy of the innovator’s product approved based on an ANDA, will be deemed therapeutically equivalent. Every state either permits or requires pharmacists to dispense a therapeutically equivalent generic drug when a doctor prescribes an innovator’s drug by its brand name, unless the doctor has said not to. The notion advanced by critics of alleged “evergreening” is that once an innovator introduces a newer version of its branded product, doctors will prescribe the newer version. And because the generic company instead copied the older version, pharmacists will not — cannot under state law — substitute the generic product when the patient presents a prescription for the newer innovator product. The problem with this argument is that actual dispensing decisions probably reflect a more complex interaction of prescriber decisions, payer preferences, and state law. To begin with, a doctor may specify either branded drugs or generic drugs. A doctor could write the brand name, to be sure, but the doctor could also simply identify the active ingredient, which will usually lead the pharmacist to dispense one of the available generic drugs. In theory, the doctor could even identify a particular generic company’s drug containing a particular active ingredient. And while drugmakers rarely promote generic drugs to doctors and patients, nothing prevents them from doing so. They do promote their therapeutically equivalent generic drugs to pharmacies and payers, focusing on the lower prices they offer. And a company that filed a hybrid application for a product that differed from the innovator’s product might brand its product and promote the distinguishing features, or (depending on the reason it filed the hybrid application) position the product as a near‐​duplicate of the more expensive branded alternatives and promote it as such. In short, an innovator’s newer product creates a new choice for doctors and payers. To be sure, if doctors select this product, pharmacists will dispense it rather than generic copies of the innovator’s older product. Doctors might shift their prescribing to the newer product for many reasons, including persuasive advertising and promotion — meaning they come to believe (based on advertising that, per FDA rules, must be truthful and not misleading) that there are benefits to the newer product. They might shift for other reasons, including experience treating patients with the two options. But companies may advertise and promote generic products to doctors and patients as well, and based on this advertising (or for other reasons, such as experience with the older innovative product that the competitor copied) doctors might not select the innovator’s newer product. They might specify the innovator’s older product (which would lead to automatic substitution, even if the innovator no longer markets the product) or, again, a generic product itself. Generic companies will be able to introduce copies of the innovator’s first product and they may or may not enjoy sales depending on the choices they make and the choices made by others in the market. The assumption that competing companies depend on automatic substitution for market share may be simplistic. Only a minority of states require substitution; most instead have permissive laws. In these states, if a generic product is therapeutically equivalent to the prescribed product and the payer requires its use, the permissive state pharmacy law makes it possible for a pharmacist to substitute, in accordance with the patient’s insurance, without consulting the physician. In these cases, the patient’s insurance drives the product selection. State law just makes it possible to comply with the insurance without contacting the doctor. If a payer perceives the innovator’s new product as less cost effective than available generic drugs containing the same active ingredient, it may decline to cover the product. A rational payer will adopt strategies that steer doctors and patients to less expensive products that are equally or adequately effective — not only those that are therapeutically equivalent, but also those that are not. In these cases, even if a doctor specifies a branded product, the patient’s insurance might prompt a conversation among the doctor, pharmacist, and patient, ultimately leading to modification of the prescription and dispensing of the cheaper copy of the innovator’s first‐​version product. In short, when an innovator introduces a new product into the market, generic companies will be able to introduce copies of the innovator’s first product and they may or may not enjoy sales depending on the choices they make and the choices made by others in the market. In this scenario, products compete for the business of rational payers based on their comparative benefits and cost. Substitution may play almost no true role, and whether the innovator still markets its older branded product may be irrelevant.