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#### Pharma innovation high now – monetary incentive is the biggest factor.

**Swagel 21** Phillip L. Swagel, Director of the Congressional budget office 4-xx-2021, "Research and Development in the Pharmaceutical Industry," Congressional Budget Office, <https://www.cbo.goc/publication/57126#_idTextAnchor020> SJ//DA

**Every year, the U.S. pharmaceutical industry develops a variety of new drugs that provide valuable medical benefits. Many of those drugs are expensive and contribute to rising health care costs for the private sector and the federal government. Policymakers have considered policies that would lower drug prices and reduce federal drug expenditures. Such policies would probably reduce the industry’s incentive to develop new drugs.** In this report, the Congressional Budget Office assesses trends in spending for drug research and development (R&D) and the introduction of new drugs. CBO also examines factors that determine how much drug companies spend on R&D: expected global revenues from a new drug; cost to develop a new drug; and federal policies that affect the demand for drug therapies, the supply of new drugs, or both. What Are Recent Trends in Pharmaceutical R&D and New Drug Approvals? T**he pharmaceutical industry devoted $83 billion to R&D expenditures in 2019. Those expenditures covered a variety of activities, including discovering and testing new drugs, developing incremental innovations such as product extensions, and clinical testing for safety-monitoring or marketing purposes. That amount is about 10 times what the industry spent per year in the 1980s, after adjusting for the effects of inflation.** The share of revenues that drug companies devote to R&D has also grown: **On average, pharmaceutical companies spent about one-quarter of their revenues (net of expenses and buyer rebates) on R&D expenses** in 2019, which is **almost twice as large a share of revenues as they spent in 2000.** That revenue share is larger than that for other knowledge-based industries, such as semiconductors, technology hardware, and software. The number of new drugs approved each year has also grown over the past decade. On averace, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved 38 new drugs per year from 2010 through 2019 (with a peak of 59 in 2018), which is 60 percent more than the yearly average over the previous decade. **Many of the drugs that have been approved in recent years are “specialty drugs.” Specialty drugs generally treat chronic, complex, or rare conditions, and they may also require special handling or monitoring of patients**. Many specialty drugs are biologics (large-molecule drugs based on living cell lines), **which are costly to develop, hard to imitate, and frequently have high prices.** Previously, most drugs were small-molecule drugs based on chemical compounds. Even while they were under patent, those drugs had lower prices than recent specialty drugs have. Information about the kinds of drugs in current clinical trials indicates that much of the industry’s innovative activity is focused on specialty drugs that would provide new cancer therapies and treatments for nervous-system disorders, such as Alzheimer’s disease and Parkinson’s disease. **What Factors Influence Spending for R&D?** Drug companies’ R&D spending decisions depend on three main factors: Anticipated lifetime global revenues from a new drug, **Expected costs to develop a new drug**, and Policies and programs that influence the supply of and demand for prescription drugs. Various considerations inform companies’ expectations about a drug’s revenue stream, including the anticipated prices it could command in different markets around the world and the expected global sales volume at those prices (given the number of people who might use the drug). The prices and sales volumes of existing drugs provide information about consumers’ and insurance plans’ willingness to pay for drug treatments. Importantly, when drug companies set the prices of a new drug, they do so to maximize future revenues net of manufacturing and distribution costs. A drug’s sunk R&D costs—that is, the costs already incurred in developing that drug—do not influence its price. **Developing new drugs is a costly and uncertain process, and many potential drugs never make it to market. Only about 12 percent of drugs entering clinical trials are ultimately approved for introduction by the FDA. In recent studies, estimates of the average R&D cost per new drug range from less than $1 billion to more than $2 billion per drug**. Those estimates include the costs of both laboratory research and clinical trials of successful new drugs as well as expenditures on drugs that do not make it past the laboratory-development stage, that enter clinical trials but fail in those trials or are withdrawn by the drugmaker for business reasons, or that are not approved by the FDA. Those estimates also include the company’s capital costs—the value of other forgone investments—incurred during the R&D process. Such costs can make up a substantial share of the average total cost of developing a new drug. The development process often takes a decade or more, and during that time the company does not receive a financial return on its investment in developing that drug. The federal government affects R&D decisions in three ways. First, it increases demand for prescription drugs, which encourages new drug development, by fully or partially subsidizing the purchase of prescription drugs through a variety of federal programs (including Medicare and Medicaid) and by providing tax preferences for employment-based health insurance. Second, the federal government increases the supply of new drugs. It funds basic biomedical research that provides a scientific foundation for the development of new drugs by private industry. Additionally, tax credits—both those available to all types of companies and those available to drug companies for developing treatmentscof uncommon diseases—provide incentives to invest in R&D. Similarly, deductions for R&D investment can be used to reduce tax liabilities immediately rather than over the life of that investment. Finally, the patent system and certain statutory provisions that delay FDA approval of generic drugs provide pharmaceutical companies with a period of market exclusivity, when competition is legally restricted. During that time, they can maintain higher prices on a patented product than they otherwise could, which makes new drugs more profitable and thereby increases drug companies’ incentives to invest in R&D. Third, some federal policies affect the number of new drugs by influencing both demand and supply. For example, federal recommendations for specific vaccines increase the demand for those vaccines and provide an incentive for drug companies to develop new ones. Additionally, federal regulatory policies that influence returns on drug R&D can bring about increases or decreases in both the supply of and demand for new drugs. Trends in R&D Spending and New Drug Development Private spending on pharmaceutical R&D and the approval of new drugs have both increased markedly in recent years, resuming a decades-long trend that was interrupted in 2008 as generic versions of some top-selling drugs became available and as the 2007–2009 recession occurred. **In particular, spending on drug R&D increased by nearly 50 percent between 2015 and 2019.** Many of the drugs approved in recent years are high-priced specialty drugs for relatively small numbers of potential patients. By contrast, the top-selling drugs of the 1990s were lower-cost drugs with large patient populations. R&D Spending R&D spending in the pharmaceutical industry covers a variety of activities, including the following: Invention, or research and discovery of new drugs; Development, or clinical testing, preparation and submission of applications for FDA approval, and design of production processes for new drugs; Incremental innovation, including the development of new dosages and delivery mechanisms for existing drugs and the testing of those drugs for additional indications; Product differentiation, or the clinical testing of a new drug against an existing rival drug to show that the new drug is superior; and Safety monitoring, or clinical trials (conducted after a drug has reached the market) that the FDA may require to detect side effects that may not have been observed in shorter trials when the drug was in development. In real terms**, private investment in drug R&D among member firms of the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA), an industry trade association, was about $83 billion in 2019, up from about $5 billion in 1980 and $38 billion in 2000**.1 Although those spending totals do not include spending by many smaller drug companies that do not belong to PhRMA, the trend is broadly representative of R&D spending by the industry as a whole.2 A survey of all U.S. pharmaceutical R&D spending (including that of smaller firms) by the National Science Foundation (NSF) reveals similar trends.3 Although total R&D spending by all drug companies has trended upward, small and large firms generally focus on different R&D activities. **Small companies not in PhRMA devote a greater share of their research to developing and testing new drugs,** many of which are ultimately sold to larger firms (see Box 1). By contrast, a greater portion of the R&D spending of larger drug companies (including those in PhRMA) is devoted to conducting clinical trials, developing incremental “line extension” improvements (such as new dosages or delivery systems, or new combinations of two or more existing drugs), and conducting postapproval testing for safety-monitoring or marketing purposes.

#### The aff crushes innovation in the pharma sector---incentivizes them to focus on non-important issues.

Glassman 21 [Amanda; 5/6/21; Executive vice president and a senior fellow at the Center for Global Development, a nonpartisan, nonprofit think tank in Washington and London; “*Big Pharma Is Not the Tobacco Industry*,” Barron, <https://www.barrons.com/articles/big-pharma-is-not-the-tobacco-industry-51620315693>] Justin

But here is the crux of the problem: The pharmaceutical industry is not the tobacco industry. They are not merchants of death. The companies are amoral and exist to make money, but their business is not fundamentally immoral. Big Pharma (mostly) develops and sells products that people need to survive and thrive. Their products improve health and welfare. Fights over access to medicines are possible because medicines exist in the first place—medicines that were usually developed by Big Pharma. And yes, the pharmaceutical industry benefits from public subsidy and publicly financed foundational research. But the companies also put their own capital at risk to develop new products, some of which offer enormous public benefits. In fact, several of them did just that in the pandemic: invested their own money to develop patented manufacturing technologies in record time. Those technologies are literally saving the world right now. Public funding supported research and development, but companies also brought their own proprietary ingenuity and private investments to bear toward solving the world’s singular, collective challenge. Their reward should be astronomical given the insane scale of the health and economic benefits these highly efficacious vaccines produce every day. Market incentives sent a clear signal that further needed innovation—greater efficacy, single doses, more-rapid manufacturing, updated formulations, fast boosters, and others—would be richly rewarded. Market incentives could also have been used to lubricate supply lines and buy vaccines on behalf of the entire world; with enough money, incredible things can happen. But activist lobbying to waive patents—a move the Biden administration endorsed yesterday—sends exactly the opposite signal. It says that the most important, valuable innovations will be penalized, not rewarded. It tells innovators, don’t bother attacking the most important global problems; instead, throw your investment dollars at the next treatment for erectile disfunction, which will surely earn you a steady return with far less agita. It is worth going back to first principles. What problem are we trying to solve? We have highly efficacious vaccines that we would like to get out to the entire world as quickly as possible to minimize, preventable disease and deaths address atrocious inequities, and enable the reopening of society, trade, and commerce. Hundreds of millions of people have been plunged into poverty over the past year; in the developing world, the pandemic is just getting started. What is the quickest way to get this done? Vaccine manufacturing is not just a recipe; if you attack and undermine the companies that have the know-how, do you really expect they’ll be eager to help you set up manufacturing elsewhere? Is the plan to march into Pfizer and force its staff to redeploy to Costa Rica to build a new factory? Do the U.S. administration or activists care that this decision could take years to negotiate at the World Trade Organization, and will likely be litigated for years thereafter? Does it make sense to eliminate the incentive for private companies to invest in vaccine R&D or in the response to the next health emergency? And if the patent waiver is only temporary and building a factory takes months or years, will anyone bother to do so, even if they could? No, none of it makes sense. Worse still, we could solve the policy problem more easily by harnessing market incentives for the global good by ponying up cash to vaccinate the entire world. No confiscation necessary.

#### Pharma Innovation prevents Extinction – checks new diseases.

Engelhardt 8, H. Tristram. Innovation and the pharmaceutical industry: critical reflections on the virtues of profit. M & M Scrivener Press, 2008 (doctorate in philosophy (University of Texas at Austin), M.D. (Tulane University), professor of philosophy (Rice University), and professor emeritus at Baylor College of Medicine)

Many are suspicious of, or indeed jealous of, the good fortune of others. Even when profit is gained in the market without fraud and with the consent of all buying and selling goods and services, there is a sense on the part of some that something is wrong if considerable profit is secured. There is even a sense that good fortune in the market, especially if it is very good fortune, is unfair. One might think of such rhetorically disparaging terms as "wind-fall profits". There is also a suspicion of the pursuit of profit because it is often embraced not just because of the material benefits it sought, but because of the hierarchical satisfaction of being more affluent than others. The pursuit of profit in the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries is tor many in particular morally dubious because it is acquired from those who have the bad fortune to be diseased or disabled. Although the suspicion of profit is not well-founded, this suspicion is a major moral and public-policy challenge. Profit in the market for the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries is to be celebrated. This is the case, in that if one is of the view (1) that the presence of additional resources for research and development spurs innovation in the development of pharmaceuticals and med-ical devices (i.e., if one is of the view that the allure of **profit is one of the most effective ways not only to acquire resources but productively to direct human energies** in their use), (2) that given the limits of altruism and of the willingness of persons to be taxed, the possibility of profits is necessary to secure such resources, (3) that the allure of profits also tends to enhance the creative use of available resources in the pursuit of phar-maceutical and medical-device innovation, and (4) if one judges it to be the case that such innovation is both necessary to maintain the human species in an ever-changing and always dangerous environment in which new microbial and other threats may at any time emerge to threaten human well-being, if not survival (i.e., that such innovation is necessary to prevent increases in morbidity and mortality risks), as well as (5) in order generally to decrease morbidity and mortality risks in the future, it then follows (6) that one should be concerned regarding any policies that decrease the amount of resources and energies available to encourage such innovation. One should indeed be of the view that the possibilities for profit, all things being equal, should be highest in the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries. Yet, there is a suspicion regarding the pursuit of profit in medicine and especially in the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries.

#### Pharma spills-over – has cascading global impacts that are necessary for human survival.

NAS 8 National Academy of Sciences 12-3-2008 “The Role of the Life Sciences in Transforming America's Future Summary of a Workshop” //Re-cut by Elmer

Fostering Industries to Counter Global Problems The life sciences have applications in areas that range far beyond human health. Life-science based approaches could **contribute to advances in** many industries, from energy production and pollution remediation, to clean manufacturing and the production of new biologically inspired materials. In fact, biological systems could provide the basis for new products, services and industries that we cannot yet imagine. Microbes are already producing biofuels and could, through further research, provide a major component of future energy supplies. Marine and terrestrial organisms extract carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, which suggests that biological systems could be used to help manage climate change. Study of the complex systems encountered in biology is decade, it is really just the beginning.” Advances in the underlying science of plant and animal breeding have been just as dramatic as the advances in genetic can put down a band of fertilizer, come back six months later, and plant seeds exactly on that row, reducing the need for fertilizer, pesticides, and other agricultural inputs. Fraley said that the global agricultural system needs to adopt the goal of doubling the current yield of **crops while reducing key inputs like pesticides, fertilizers, and water** by one third. “It is more important than putting a man on the moon,” he said. Doubling agricultural yields would “change the world.” Another billion people will join the middle class over the next decade just in India and China as economies continue to grow. And all people need and deserve secure access to food supplies. Continued progress will require both basic and applied research, The evolution of life “put earth under new management,” Collins said. Understanding the future state of the planet will require understanding the biological systems that have shaped the planet. Many of these biological systems are found in the oceans, which cover 70 percent of the earth’s surface and have a crucial impact on weather, climate, and the composition of the atmosphere. In the past decade, new tools have become available to explore the microbial processes that drive the **chemistry of the oceans**, observed David Kingsbury, Chief Program Officer for Science at the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. These technologies have revealed that a large proportion of the planet’s genetic diversity resides in the oceans. In addition, many organisms in the oceans readily exchange genes, creating evolutionary forces that can have global effects. The oceans are currently under great stress, Kingsbury pointed out. Nutrient runoff from agriculture is helping to create huge and expanding “dead zones” where oxygen levels are too low to sustain life. Toxic algal blooms are occurring with higher frequency in areas where they have not been seen in the past. Exploitation of ocean resources is disrupting ecological balances that have formed over many millions of years. Human-induced changes in the chemistry of the atmosphere are changing the chemistry of the oceans, with potentially catastrophic consequences. “If we are not careful, we are not going to have a sustainable planet to live on,” said Kingsbury. Only by understanding the basic biological processes at work in the oceans can humans live sustainably on earth.

## 2

#### WTO consensus on fishing subsidies likely now but requires negotiations- consensus is key to solving overfishing- the brink is now.

Koop 21 [Fermin; Argentine journalist specializing in the environment with experience across diverse publications; “WTO Inches Towards a Deal to End Harmful Fishing Subsidies,” Maritime-Executive; 7/30/21; <https://www.maritime-executive.com/editorials/wto-inches-towards-a-deal-to-end-harmful-fishing-subsidies>] Justin

After more than 20 years of negotiations, the World Trade Organization (WTO) has moved a step closer to an agreement on ending harmful fishing subsidies. The deal would set new rules for the global fishing industry and limit government funding that contributes to unsustainable fishing and the depletion of global fish stocks. In a meeting with government ministers and heads of national delegations, WTO members vowed to finish the negotiations before the WTO’s Twelfth Ministerial Conference (MC12) in late November, and to empower their delegations in Geneva to do so. Members also said the negotiating text currently on the table can be used as the basis to strike a final agreement. “It’s been a successful day,” WTO chief Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala told reporters at the close of the meeting. “In 20 years of negotiations, this is the closest we have ever come towards reaching an outcome – a high-quality outcome that would contribute to building a sustainable blue economy. I feel new hope.” The talks’ chair, Santiago Wills, was also upbeat: “I believe that the answers today have given us the ingredients to reach a successful conclusion. Members now want to move to text-based negotiations. Twenty years has been long enough. If we continue [negotiating] for another 20 years, there won’t be any fish left.” Negotiators at the WTO had been tasked with eliminating subsidies for illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and prohibiting certain subsidies that contribute to overcapacity and overfishing. Talks have been going on since 2001 but differences between governments have hindered progress. 2020 had been set as a deadline to strike an agreement, but talks were delayed due to Covid-19 restrictions and the US presidential elections. A deadline was then set for this July, which was again missed. Now, Okonjo-Iweala, appointed as head of the WTO in March, aims to reach an agreement by year-end in what will be a key test for the organization’s credibility, with members deadlocked on other fronts. “In international negotiations of this type only two things are relevant. The nitty-gritty to make sure everybody is on the same page, and the spirit that prevails. If Ngozi and Wills reflected correctly what happened in the meeting, we can say there’s cautious optimism over an agreement,” Remi Parmentier, director of environmental consultancy The Varda Group, told China Dialogue Ocean. A potential agreement At the meeting, ministers discussed an eight-page draft agreement, which lists a range of subsidy bans and some conditions for exemptions for poorer countries, all of which are yet to be finalised. While some delegations like the EU were positive, several ministers expressed reservations over the content of the text. “Clearly, it will lead to capacity constraints for developing countries, while advanced nations will continue to grant subsidies,” Indian trade minister Piyush Goyal said at the meeting, regarding one part of the text. Pakistan described the draft as “regressive and unbalanced,” while the African coalition said “significant gaps” remain. Countries’ differences were acknowledged by Ngozi and Wills at the meeting. Nevertheless, they remain optimistic and said the issues would be resolved once countries move into text-based negotiations. The agreement on fishing subsidies will require a consensus among all member states, according to WTO rules. The draft deal essentially proposes three categories of prohibited subsidies; those that support IUU fishing, affect overfished stocks, or lead to overcapacity and overfishing. While this may sound simple, the political, economic and cultural complexities represent real challenges. One of the main issues has been the demand for developing countries and the poorest nations to receive so-called special and differential treatment. While this is widely accepted for the poorest countries, demands from self-identified developing countries to be exempt from subsidy constraints has proven to be difficult to accept. Many of the major fishing nations are considered developing countries by the WTO, including China, which has one of the world’s biggest fishing fleets. China’s minister of commerce, Wang Wentao, expressed China’s “support for the conclusion of [fishing subsidies] negotiations before the end of MC12.” Speaking at the meeting on 15 July, Wang stressed that concluding the negotiations would represent a major contribution from the WTO to the United Nations’ 2030 Sustainable Development Goals. “As a developing country and a major fishing power, China will take on obligations commensurate with our level of development," he said. At the meeting, Wang also introduced China’s emphasis on green development in future policies on fishing subsidies and its “zero-tolerance” policy towards IUU. Isabel Jarrett, manager of The Pew Charitable Trusts’ project to end harmful fisheries subsidies, told China Dialogue Ocean that an agreement “with too many loopholes” would undermine the WTO’s sustainability goals. The final text has to ensure that governments aren’t allowed to subsidize “irresponsible practices that can hurt fish populations,” she added. The scale of the problem Subsidies paid to the global fishing industry amount to around $35 billion per year (228 billion yuan). Of this, $20 billion is given in forms that enhance the capacity of large fishing fleets, such as fuel subsidies and tax exemption programmes, according to the European Parliament’s Committee on Fisheries. In 2018, the world’s top 10 providers of harmful fisheries subsidies gave out $15.4 billion in total, according to a report by Oceana. The EU, as a bloc, provided $2 billion, ranking third behind China and Japan. Research by Pew has found that eliminating all harmful subsidies could help fish populations recover. Specifically, it would result in an increase of 12.5 percent in global fish biomass by 2050, which translates into nearly 35 million metric tonnes of fish – almost three times Africa’s entire fish consumption in a single year. The need for progress on an agreement has gained new urgency during the last few years, as the world’s fish populations have continued to fall below sustainable levels. Around 60 percent of assessed stocks are fully exploited and 30 percent are overexploited, according to the latest figures from the UN Food and Agriculture Organization. The termination of harmful subsidies, which is embedded in the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), would be seen as key progress on ocean sustainability ahead of this year’s UN biodiversity conference in Kunming, scheduled for October, and the COP26 climate summit in Glasgow in November. “This is the year that the agreement has to be delivered. The WTO chief has made positive pronouncements of an agreement this year. There’s light at the end of this 20-year tunnel. The alternative of being in the tunnel shadows is a depressing prospect at the time ocean life is declining,” Peter Thomson,?UN special envoy for the ocean, said in a recent webinar.

#### Negotiations on IPR require tradeoffs- empirics prove.

DC = DEVELOPING COUNTRY

NET = NET EXPORTER OF TECH (advanced countries)

TNC = Trade Negotiations Committee

Anell = Lars Anell the Chair of the TRIPS negotiations

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. SJMS

Regarding the provisions in the section on patents, including that on exclusions from patentability, another DC negotiator maintained that the stipulations should reflect ‘a well-balanced system’ (ibid: 3). Ironically however, he proceeded to categorise the texts as ‘reasonably satisfactory’, contending that a positive attitude of his delegation towards them would depend to a large extent on progress in other areas of the negotiation (ibid). This was the second time in the negotiations that a DC delegate made such an obvious attempt to concede in TRIPS while seeking bargains in other negotiating areas, suggesting that the real access-to-medicines implications of patents were not fully appreciated by all such participants (Abbott 2002: 43–4); and that such participants may have understood that the negotiations would not have culminated in their favour. Immediately after the April TNC of 1989 a similarly affiliated participant had also affirmed that if some participants were to be required to make sacrifices in the area of IPRs, there should be a readiness to make such sacrifices for their benefit in agriculture, natural resources or other negotiating groups (MTN.GNG/NG11/13: 5).10 This first declaration could be construed as a signal of a prejudged outcome that disfavoured DCs. Towards the end of this session another DC participant, supported by several others, pointed out that some other delegations had very high ambitions in the area of TRIPS and that the time had come to review the subject matter in the context of the Uruguay Round negotiations as a whole, particularly in relation to what was being offered in the more traditional areas of the GATT (ibid: 12). At these final stages in the negotiations, DCs were actively seeking trade-offs in other areas in return for agreeing to IPRs in the manner in which the NETs had anticipated (Adede 2003: 30 and Matthews 2002: 109). Anell’s informal consultations and his proposed bilateral bargaining strategies worked in tandem to consolidate the weakening position of DCs propagated during the April TNC meeting in 1989. Anell ended this final session by sharing concerns expressed about the need for results in all areas of the UR, explicitly urging delegations to manufacture consensus through concessionary bargaining. The effects would later be seen in Dunkel’s ‘Draft Final Acts Embodying the Results of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations’.11

#### That collapses biodiversity.

Osmanski 20 [Stephanie; Freelance Journaler, Writer at GreenMatters; “How Does Overfishing Affect Biodiversity? Let's Do a Deep Dive,” GreenMatters; 12/29/20; <https://www.greenmatters.com/p/how-overfishing-affects-biodiversity>] Justin

Three out of seven people — about 260 million worldwide — rely on seafood as their primary source of protein, which means the environmental and health impacts of fishing are more relevant than ever. In fact, overfishing is becoming a huge problem; Conservation.org reports that one-third of the world’s wild-caught fisheries are depleted as a direct result of overfishing, pollution, and climate change. As fish populations decline, farmed fisheries have started supplying most of our seafood, which is often plagued with additives, growth hormones, genetically modified organisms, and even food dye. However, overfishing results in other issues, too — mainly, environmental issues. Overfishing significantly affects biodiversity, which in turn, changes the ecosystem. Keep reading to find out more on how overfishing contributes to biodiversity. What is overfishing? Overfishing refers to non-sustainable practices of fishing that result in the depletion of fish species. In layman’s terms, overfishing happens when fishermen catch fish faster than the fish can reproduce. Long ago, when fishing relied on more natural methods (instinct, word-of-mouth, and guesswork), fishing practices were more natural and therefore, sustainable. But due to modern technology, fishermen now get significant help from high-tech machinery that can detect and track schools of fish, enable fishermen to explore new areas of water they had not been able to access before, and also embark in deeper waters. According to the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), over 70 percent of the world’s fisheries are “fully exploited,” “over exploited,” or “significantly depleted” as a direct result of overfishing. What is biodiversity? Biodiversity refers to the variety of life on Earth, referring to our planet’s vast number of biological species and organisms. It's heavily impacted when certain species cease to exist, or become threatened at a rate that is faster than that species can reproduce. Ultimately, the number of plants, animals, and microorganism species on Earth determines biodiversity. According to Global Issues, varying genes in each of these species also contributes to more biodiversity. If ecosystems or species become threatened or cease to exist, biodiversity decreases — and ultimately, all walks of life are impacted — because of the degrading food chain and other necessary biological processes. How does overfishing affect biodiversity? Overfishing impacts biodiversity in more ways than one — per Marine Science Today, overfishing alters the food chain. If a certain species is wiped out due to overfishing, the animals that rely on that species as a food source could starve, or might resort to eating other species of fish, thus altering the ecosystem and food chain as a whole. On the other end of the spectrum, the population generally consumed by the extinct species would grow disproportionately, often making way for an influx of pests. Overfishing creates a domino effect that impacts all living organisms, therefore significantly affecting biodiversity. Why is biodiversity important? Biodiversity is necessary, because every organism plays a role in the eco-system. If one species is compromised, biodiversity becomes compromised as a whole: the food chain, ecosystems, and more. The more biodiversity there is on this planet, the more productive ecosystems are, contributing to a greater availability of biological resources. Apart from food, biodiversity impacts medicinal resources, wood products, and ornamental plants. Biodiversity also helps ecosystems recover in cases of disaster. If a weather event threatens natural disasters, healthy, biodiverse ecosystems have a better chance of bouncing back. It also ensures protection of water resources, soil formation, nutrient storage and recycling, and the necessary breakdown of pollution. Why is marine biodiversity is important to humans? Aside from assuring food security, marine biodiversity also provides social and socioeconomic benefits. Socioeconomically, many areas of the world rely on fisheries to survive. If fishermen cannot sell seafood, fisheries cannot purchase fish, and these ways of life are forced out of business. A side effect of that would be that so many populations that rely on fisheries would be out of their main source of protein. Biodiversity also brings many social benefits to human populations: the opportunities to research and educate about fisheries, natural habitats, ecosystems, and various species. It also increases tourism and recreational activities, while having a lasting cultural impact, too — if specific populations rely on a species for food, loss of that population would affect that population’s culture and food supply. Marine biodiversity is incredibly important — let's take a stand against overfishing to ensure it doesn't plague eco-systems and human populations alike. TBH, might be best to go fish-free. instead.

#### Biodiversity loss causes extinction.

Torres 19[Phil; Affiliate Scholar at the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, Founder of the X-Risks Institute, Writer Appearing in Skeptic, Free Inquiry, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Salon, Truthout, Erkenntnis, Metaphilosophy; “Biodiversity Loss: An Existential Risk Comparable To Climate Change,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists; 4/11/16; <https://thebulletin.org/2016/04/biodiversity-loss-an-existential-risk-comparable-to-climate-change/>] Justin

Catastrophic consequences for civilization. The consequences of this rapid pruning of the evolutionary tree of life extend beyond the obvious. There could be surprising effects of biodiversity loss that scientists are unable to fully anticipate in advance. For example, prior research has shown that localized ecosystems can undergo abrupt and irreversible shifts when they reach a tipping point. According to a 2012 paper published in Nature, there are reasons for thinking that we may be approaching a tipping point of this sort in the global ecosystem, beyond which the consequences could be catastrophic for civilization.

As the authors write, a planetary-scale transition could precipitate “substantial losses of ecosystem services required to sustain the human population.” An ecosystem service is any ecological process that benefits humanity, such as food production and crop pollination. If the global ecosystem were to cross a tipping point and substantial ecosystem services were lost, the results could be “widespread social unrest, economic instability, and loss of human life.” According to Missouri Botanical Garden ecologist Adam Smith, one of the paper’s co-authors, this could occur in a matter of decades—far more quickly than most of the expected consequences of climate change, yet equally destructive.

Biodiversity loss is a “threat multiplier” that, by pushing societies to the brink of collapse, will exacerbate existing conflicts and introduce entirely new struggles between state and non-state actors. Indeed, it could even fuel the rise of terrorism. (After all, climate change has been linked to the emergence of ISIS in Syria, and multiple high-ranking US officials, such as former US Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel and CIA director John Brennan, have affirmed that climate change and terrorism are connected.)

The reality is that we are entering the sixth mass extinction in the 3.8-billion-year history of life on Earth, and the impact of this event could be felt by civilization “in as little as three human lifetimes,” as the aforementioned 2012 Nature paper notes. Furthermore, the widespread decline of biological populations could plausibly initiate a dramatic transformation of the global ecosystem on an even faster timescale: perhaps a single human lifetime.

The unavoidable conclusion is that biodiversity loss constitutes an existential threat in its own right. As such, it ought to be considered alongside climate change and nuclear weapons as one of the most significant contemporary risks to human prosperity and survival.