# 1NC vs Saratoga AG

## OFF

### 1NC - OFF

T-member nations

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives may not defend a subset of World Trade Organization members ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.

#### "The member nations" denotes the totality of member nations in the WTO.

Sharvy 80 [Richard Sharvy, philosopher. "A More General Theory of Definite Descriptions on JSTOR," The Philosophical Review, Vol. 89, No. 4, Oct. 1980, accessed 8-22-2021, https://www.jstor.org/stable/2184738] HWIC

3. Definite Plural Descriptions. Phrases like 'the sheep in New Zealand' and 'the people in Auckland' are also ordinary and common definite descriptions, and they do denote. But because their contained predicates are plural predicates like 'are people in Auckland', which apply to more than one object, such expressions are not subject to a Russellian analysis. There is no such thing as (ax \* x are people in Auckland), since a number of distinct items satisfy the predicate-the men in Auckland are people in Auckland, and so are the women in Auckland and the children in Auckland. The definite plural description 'the people in Auckland' designates the sum or totality of all the people in Auckland. This is the sum of all that to which the predicate 'are people in Auckland' applies: the sum of all the items such as the women in Auckland, the children in Auckland, etc., that satisfy the plural predicate 'are people in Auckland'. What sort of entity is the denotation of a definite plural description such as 'the children in Auckland'? A first attempt might be to say that such expressions denote sets or classes. Then a sum of such items would be the union of such classes. Russell would insist on calling the people in Auckland a "class as many" (1903, pp. 68-72, 76-77). But if the predicate 'are people in Auckland' is taken to apply to x just if x is a set of people in Auckland,5 then the definite plural description 'the people in Auckland' refers to the union of these sets: U {x: x is a set of people in Auckland). So let us first consider set-theoretic union as a candidate for the sort of sum needed here in the analysis of definite plural descriptions. This might seem more complicated than '{x: x is a person in Auckland)', which refers to the same class. But the former expression has the advantage of preserving the predicate as a plural predicate, as it appeared in the original definite plural description. A standard definition of union is U a = {x: (ay) (x ecy .y E a)) (cf. Quine 1963, p. 53). In my notation this would be written: Ua = {x:xe(Qy yEa)) -the x's that are a member of some member of a. Quine observes 5I do not say 'nonempty' simply because it would be redundant: no class of people is empty. I do include the singletons, so that {Sharvy} are people in Auckland. This might seem odd. However, the instances or instantiations of 'all men are mortal' include sentences like 'Sharvy is mortal' along with sentences like 'the men in Auckland are mortal'; thus, the plural does include the singular. Notice that 'all men are mortal' should be symbolized '(x) (x are men D x are mortal)'; logic students are generally wrongly taught to write '(x) (x is a man D x is mortal)', which is more properly a symbolization of 'every man is mortal', which has the singular subject 'every man'. 616 This content downloaded from 92.63.104.30 on Sat, 28 Jun 2014 13:35:30 PM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions DEFINITE DESCRIPTIONS that if everything is a class, this definition implies that the union U {x} of a singleton is its member x; this effect is preserved for an apparent nonclass by identifying it with its own unit class. So with this convention, if G applies to exactly one object, then U {x: Gx} = ( 7x . Gx ). So the Russellian definite singular description again emerges, here as a species of definite plural description.6 This would occur with, e.g., 'the men in this room' if there were exactly one man in the room. Notice also that plural predicates, like mass predicates, are cumulative: any sum of parts which are cats are cats. So 'G(the G)' holds for any instantiated plural predicate when 'the G' is defined as such a sum: the men in Auckland are men in Auckland, the poor are poor, etc. The analysis of definite plural description as union is not entirely satisfactory. One reason is that it explicitly uses the mechanism of class abstraction and the membership relation in a way that requires that such definite plural descriptions do denote classes. Now there is no problem about what 'the people in Auckland' denotes: it denotes the people in Auckland. Whether the people in Auckland are a set or class is an ontological question that should be discussed elsewhere. (Indeed, ontological questions generally should be independent of a theory of descriptions: we should be able to explain phrases like 'the first symphony of Beethoven' without discussing the ontological nature of symphonies.) My aim here is simply to explain plural definite descriptions like 'the people in Auckland' in a way that remains neutral on that ontological question by avoiding explicitly settheoretic notions. Another reason to turn away from the above analysis of 'the C as 'U {x: Gx}' is that it lacks generality. It lets in too much 6 I thank W. V. Quine for calling my attention to this passage. 'one object' means 'one class'. Consider the predicate 'are men and women in this room', and suppose the room contains just one man, m, and one woman, w. Then only one object, {m,w} satisfies that predicate, and U {a: a are men and women in this room) = U {{m,w}} = {m,w} = (7a a are men and women in this room). See note 8 also. Consider the definite description 'the square root of 2'. This is ordinarily used to refer to the positive square root of 2. My theory explains this; if real numbers are defined in the usual way as lower cuts of rationals (cf. Russell 1903, ch. 33), the positive root is the union of the negative and positive roots. 617 This content downloaded from 92.63.104.30 on Sat, 28 Jun 2014 13:35:30 PM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions RICHARD SHARVY when applied to a singular definite description whose contained predicate applies to more than one object: 'the author of PM' would denote {Whitehead, Russell). This was Frege's convention (?1 1), but it is clearly artificial; 'the author of PM' should fail to denote. And finally, 'U {x: Gx)' just doesn't look enough like the analysis given earlier of definite mass descriptions. Mass terms and plural terms are alike in numerous ways, and it would be nice if their uses in forming definite descriptions had analyses that reflected this similarity. Specifically, we should express summation without using the membership relation e, which has no analogue in the semantics of mass terms. The solution is to observe that there is a part of relation available: the men in Auckland are part of the people in Auckland. (This relation looks very much like the relation of being a nonempty subset of.) Writing it as '<', we may then define 'the G' for plural predicates as (4) above: sm G that all G are part of. The requirement in (4) that x satisfy G is useful for distinguishing the definite plural description 'the authors of PM' from the definite singular description 'the author of PM'. The former denotes Whitehead and Russell, as it should.7 Without the requirementhat x satisfy G, using (1) or simply union, so would the latter. But although Whitehead and Russell are authors of PM, they are not an author of PM. That requirement also leads to the intuitively correct results for expressions like 'the Wilmington Ten' and 'the five men in this room'. If there are only four men in this toom, the description 'the five men in this room' fails to denote because the predicate 'are five men in this room' applies to nothing. If there are six men in this room, then that description also fails to denote-not because that predicate applies to more than one item (i.e., to every part of the six containing just five men), but because it fails to apply to their sum. A word of caution about part is needed here. I am taking it in what I think is its plain and ordinary sense. However, Goodman, Quine, and other writers on the theory of parts (mereology) have used it in an extended sense which is not appropriate here. 7 But it does not denote Whitehead, and it does not denote Russell. The property of being denoted by an expression is not dissective. I may refer to something without referring to each of its parts. 618 This content downloaded from 92.63.104.30 on Sat, 28 Jun 2014 13:35:30 PM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions DEFINITE DESCRIPTIONS The difference is that these writers combine mereology with a kind of materialism. (An exception is Foradori.) Thus Quine writes, "there are parts of water, sugar, and furniture too small to count as water, sugar, furniture" (1960, p. 99). Here, by 'parts of furniture' he means something like 'spatiotemporally determined parts of the material constituting the world's furniture'; by 'parts of water' he means 'spatiotemporally determined parts of the world's water'. However, in the ordinary sense of 'part', the parts of water are hydrogen and oxygen. In the ordinary sense of part, shrimp is a part of shrimp salad. Here, the words 'shrimp' and 'shrimp salad' refer to types or kinds, and not to the world's shrimp and the world's shrimp salad. Indeed, the world's shrimp is not part of the world's shrimp salad. Now, my furniture is part of the world's furniture, and the chair in my billiard room is part of my furniture. But is a leg of that chair part of my furniture? I doubt it. In a distinguishable sense of 'part', a leg of my chair is a part of that chair and a part of my furniture. In the plural of that same sense, the legs are parts of my furniture. But those legs are not part of my furniture. The matter of the legs is part of the matter of the furniture; also, the chairs in my billiard room are part of my furniture. But the legs of the chairs are not part of the furniture. The men in Auckland are part of the men and women in Auckland, but the arms of the men in Auckland are not part of the men and women in Auckland. The explanation is not that the arms fail to satisfy the contained predicate 'are men and women in Auckland', for the men in Auckland also fail to be men and women in Auckland. Rather, the explanation is that x are part of y in this ordinary sense just if x are some ofy. Notice the difference between 'some' and 'some of. It's true that some of the men and women in Auckland are men, but false that some men and women in Auckland are men. It's true that some of the whiskey-and-water inmy glass is water, but false that some whiskey-and-water inmy glass is water. 'part of' and 'some of' seem to be synonymous here; examples like these occur with mass and plural predicates that are not dissective. The legs of my chair are not part of my furniture, because 619 This content downloaded from 92.63.104.30 on Sat, 28 Jun 2014 13:35:30 PM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions RICHARD SHARVY it's false that they are some of my furniture. Given our understanding of 'part' then, being furniture and being men in Auckland are dissective properties; it is compounds like 'are men and women' that fail to be dissective. So only articles of furniture count as part of my furniture. It is a totally distinct feature of Goodman's system that causes his notion of 'part' to be broader than mine, so that, e.g., the chair legs are also part of my furniture. That feature is a sort of materialism. The set of my tables # the set of my table tops and legs; but the matter of my tables = the matter of my tops and legs. If we remove this materialism from mereology, we have a purer theory of part and whole, and consequently of sum. The mereological sum, then, of my articles of furniture is my furniture, and not the matter of my furniture. With this ordinary and intended sense of 'part', then, the expressions 'the counties of Utah' and 'the townships of Utah' will have distinct denotations, as they should. Without the distinction made above, they might appear to collapse into the same object, since the territory occupied by the counties is identical to that occupied by the townships; (px) (x is territory of (b.y) (y are counties, etc.) ) = etc. What sort of entity is denoted by the definite plural description 'the men in Auckland'? This question contains the mistaken implication that this phrase denotes a single entity. But the phrase 'the men in Auckland' obviously denotes the men in Auckland. One might ask, "What sort of entities are those?" But the answer is easy: they are entities that eat, drink, sleep, and are numerous. The error to avoid is an insistence on the singular. 'the men in Auckland' is not a singular term-it is a plural term. This should hardly need to be said. But some writers have gone astray by failing to see that plurals are plural, and so insisting that they must denote something singular. For example, Richard E. Grandy says that in the sentence 'Lions are widespread', " 'lions' must be a singular [sic] term denoting the class of lions" (p. 297). Given this, it will follow that a certain class is widespread (which does not seem as odd to me as it might to many). But what seems odd is that Grandy claims that it does not follow from his statement that any class is widespread; apparently 620 This content downloaded from 92.63.104.30 on Sat, 28 Jun 2014 13:35:30 PM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions DEFINITE DESCRIPTIONS he prefers to give up the indiscernibility of identicals rather than the dogma that classes are "abstract." Now the words 'set' and 'class' have uses as dummy nominal measure words whose only function is the syntactic one of turning a plural into an apparent singular: the rational numbers are countable -- the set of rational numbers is countable. But no semantic consequences follow from such a use of the words 'set' and 'class'. The rational numbers are the set of rational numbers; the set of rational numbers is the rational numbers. The people in this room weigh 1000 kilograms; the set of people in this room weighs 1000 kg. The men in this room are not abstract; the set of men in this room is not abstract. We can avoid Grandy's contortions simply by taking the plural seriously as a plural, and abandoning the fetish for the singular that pervades contemporary decadent Western ontology. Along these same lines we can affirm that (i) 'the world's lions are widespread' and (ii) 'the world's lions are mammalian' do have the same logical form. In particular, the form of (ii) is 'Ml' and not '(x)(Lx D Mx)'; this is clear for (i). Question: how, then, does (ii), along with 'Aslan is a lion' imply 'Aslan is mammalian'? Answer: the implication is not a formal one at all, but depends on the fact that 'are mammalian' is dissective; 'are widespread' is not dissective. This situation is quite familiar: 'Ben weighs less than 60 kg' and 'Ben's nose is part of Ben' imply 'Ben's nose weighs less than 60 kg'. But again, the implication is not formal-it is not due to the logical form of these statements (this is easily seen by putting 'more' for 'less'). Rather, the implication holds because 'weighs less than 60 kg' is dissective. 4. Conclusion. For any given predicate G there is an appropriate part of or some of relation ? on the extension of G.8 Notice that 8The structure <{x: Gx},?) is often a mereology, i.e., a model of the so-called calculus of individuals. But it may fail to be a mereology. Idefine a quasi-mereology to be any structure (S, ?) where ? partially orders S (reflexive, transitive, antisymmetric), and where the <-least upper bound of a is a member of S for every nonempty subset a of S. One interesting type of quasi-mereology results from taking the algebraic direct product of two 621 This content downloaded from 92.63.104.30 on Sat, 28 Jun 2014 13:35:30 PM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions RICHARD SHARVY for most singular count predicates, < is just the identity relation: for 'is a shoe I own' < is the identity relation, for the extension of that predicate contains no two objects of which either is part of the other. Regardless of how many shoes I own, x - y only if x = y, for every x and y in that domain. In all such cases, '( px Gx )' defined as (4) comes out as desired, designating the gold in Zurich or the men in Auckland; and if I own just one shoe, '( pxS x is a shoe I own)' designates it, but otherwise that description fails. The analysis of 'the G' as (4) is therefore a general theory of definite descriptions, of which definite mass descriptions, definite plural descriptions, and Russellian definite singular count descriptions are species.9 full mereologies. (This description of the situation is due to Mark Nixon.) For example, (M, ) X <W. 5), where M is the set of sets of men and W is the set of sets of women, is isomorphic to (MW, 5), where MW is the set of sets of men and women, i.e., of sets containing at least one man and one woman. (MW, C ) is simply the corresponding quasi-mereology of the predicate 'are men and women'; this predicate is satisfied by the people in Auckland (they are men and women), but not by the men in Auckland. The structure fails to be a mereology because it is not properly closed under subtraction: there are sets a, b, each of which are men and women, and where a - b is not null yet fails to be men and women; a - b might just be men. However, we can combine the mereologies (M, C) and <W, 5) so that a mereology results. Add the null element to each, take the direct product, and then remove the null element: ((M U {4}, 5) X (W U {4}, 5))- ((4,4), 5). This is isomorphic to the mereology corresponding to the predicate 'are adults', i.e., to the set of nonempty subsets of the set of all men and women, under subset: V(P(U (M U W)) - {4}, C). 9 We have an account of the generic 'the' along these same lines. The New Zealand Flag is a New Zealand flag to which every New Zealand flag bears a certain relation ?. This seems a little more natural if we add the syllables 'akes' or 'icipates' to the word 'part' in reading '<' here: the New Zealand Flag is that New Zealand flag in which every New Zealand flag participates. The fact that it participates in itself does not lead to a "third man" regress, because participation in, as a variant of the part of relation, is not used to explain predication; predication remains primary. Of course, nothing in my discussion requires that there be such an entity (nor does anything here count against it). My theory is quite neutral. If there is such an entity, '( px x is a New Zealand flag)' picks it out. If there is no such entity, but merely a number of flags none of which bears ? to anything but itself, then ? is coextensive with the identity relation on those flags, and the situation is the same as for 'my shoe'. John Bacon, however, claims 622 This content downloaded from 92.63.104.30 on Sat, 28 Jun 2014 13:35:30 PM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions DEFINITE DESCRIPTIONS With this analysis and some thought about examples of definite mass descriptions and definite plural descriptions, we see that the primary use of 'the' is not to indicate uniqueness. Rather, it is to indicate totality; implication of uniqueness is a side effect.

#### Semantic tests determine whether statements are generic or existential –

**Leslie and Lerner 16** [Sarah-Jane Leslie (Ph.D., Princeton, 2007) is the dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. She has previously served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University. She is also affiliated faculty in the Department of Psychology, the University Center for Human Values, the Program in Gender and Sexuality Studies, and the Kahneman-Treisman Center for Behavioral Science and Public Policy], and Adam Lerner, Ph.D, Postgraduate Research Associate in the Department of Philosophy at Princeton University, 4-24-2016, accessed 9-4-2021, "Generic Generalizations (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/>] HWIC

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

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

#### The resolution is generic: 1] "nations ought to reduce IPP for medicines" doesn't imply political bodies ought to b/c there might not be an obligation for terrorist groups or the UN 2] "nations generally ought to reduce IPP for medicines" doesn't substantially change the meaning

#### Standards:

#### Semantics --- anything other than strict adherence to the resolution means they can arbitrarily jettison any word in the resolution which kills topic stasis. Semantics outweighs pragmatics A) All pragmatic arguments concede the authority of semantics in order to convey pragmatic messages B) Key to predictability- the topic is the only thing that we have beforehand. Explodes neg prep burden and outweighs every other pragmatic consideration C) Jurisdiction – it’s not in the judge’s jurisdiction to vote for an illegitimate aff. Independent voter -- even if they prove pragmatics they lose for not defending the resolution.

#### Limits --- they can specify anything from Burudni to China to the US --- there’s no unifying generics since each country has different geopolitical nuances. That explodes NEG prep and leads to random country of the week AFFs, which makes cutting stable links for DAs or CP competition impossible.

#### TVA --- read the AFF as an advantage to a whole rez AFF --- the only reason to specify is to cut out NEG ground

#### 4) No PICs offense -- potential abuse doesn’t justify actual abuse

**And --- must disclose 30 minutes before the round and not change the AFF**

**SS in doc:**

Graphical user interface, application, Teams

Description automatically generated

#### prep skew

#### intimidation

**D] Paradigm Issues –**

**1] T is DTD – A] their abusive advocacy skewed the debate from the start B] DTA is incoherent because we indict their advocacy**

**2] Comes before 1AR theory -- A] If we had to be abusive it’s because it was impossible to engage their aff B] T outweighs on scope because their abuse affected every speech that came after the 1AC C] Topic norms outweigh on urgency – we only have a few months to set them**

**3] Use competing interps on T – A] topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical B] only our interp sets norms -- reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention C] reasonability causes a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation**

**4] No RVIs – A] Forcing the 1NC to go all in on the shell kills substance education and neg strat B] discourages checking real abuse C] Encourages baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly**

### 1NC - OFF

Util NC

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being:

#### Extinction outweighs.

--- must preserve infinite lives and generations.

--- question of intergenerational equity.

--- existential threats are underestimated: global public good, intergenerational, unprecedented, scope neglect.

GPP 17 (Global Priorities Project, Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” Global Priorities Project, 2017, <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>, Accessed 7/22/2017, Kent Denver-jKIM)

1.2. THE ETHICS OF EXISTENTIAL RISK In his book Reasons and Persons, Oxford philosopher Derek Parfit advanced an influential argument about the importance of avoiding extinction: I believe that if we destroy mankind, as we now can, this outcome will be much worse than most people think. Compare three outcomes: (1) Peace. (2) A nuclear war that kills 99% of the world’s existing population. (3) A nuclear war that kills 100%. (2) would be worse than (1), and (3) would be worse than (2). Which is the greater of these two differences? Most people believe that the greater difference is between (1) and (2). I believe that the difference between (2) and (3) is very much greater. ... The Earth will remain habitable for at least another billion years. Civilization began only a few thousand years ago. If we do not destroy mankind, these few thousand years may be only a tiny fraction of the whole of civilized human history. The difference between (2) and (3) may thus be the difference between this tiny fraction and all of the rest of this history. If we compare this possible history to a day, what has occurred so far is only a fraction of a second.65 In this argument, it seems that Parfit is assuming that the survivors of a nuclear war that kills 99% of the population would eventually be able to recover civilisation without long-term effect. As we have seen, this may not be a safe assumption – but for the purposes of this thought experiment, the point stands. What makes existential catastrophes especially bad is that they would “destroy the future,” as another Oxford philosopher, Nick Bostrom, puts it.66 This future could potentially be extremely long and full of flourishing, and would therefore have extremely large value. In standard risk analysis, when working out how to respond to risk, we work out the expected value of risk reduction, by weighing the probability that an action will prevent an adverse event against the severity of the event. Because the value of preventing existential catastrophe is so vast, even a tiny probability of prevention has huge expected value.67 Of course, there is persisting reasonable disagreement about ethics and there are a number of ways one might resist this conclusion.68 Therefore, it would be unjustified to be overconfident in Parfit and Bostrom’s argument. In some areas, government policy does give significant weight to future generations. For example, in assessing the risks of nuclear waste storage, governments have considered timeframes of thousands, hundreds of thousands, and even a million years.69 Justifications for this policy usually appeal to principles of intergenerational equity according to which future generations ought to get as much protection as current generations.70 Similarly, widely accepted norms of sustainable development require development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.71 However, when it comes to existential risk, it would seem that we fail to live up to principles of intergenerational equity. Existential catastrophe would not only give future generations less than the current generations; it would give them nothing. Indeed, reducing existential risk plausibly has a quite low cost for us in comparison with the huge expected value it has for future generations. In spite of this, relatively little is done to reduce existential risk. Unless we give up on norms of intergenerational equity, they give us a strong case for significantly increasing our efforts to reduce existential risks. 1.3. WHY EXISTENTIAL RISKS MAY BE SYSTEMATICALLY UNDERINVESTED IN, AND THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY In spite of the importance of existential risk reduction, it probably receives less attention than is warranted. As a result, concerted international cooperation is required if we are to receive adequate protection from existential risks. 1.3.1. Why existential risks are likely to be underinvested in There are several reasons why existential risk reduction is likely to be underinvested in. Firstly, it is a global public good. Economic theory predicts that such goods tend to be underprovided. The benefits of existential risk reduction are widely and indivisibly dispersed around the globe from the countries responsible for taking action. Consequently, a country which reduces existential risk gains only a small portion of the benefits but bears the full brunt of the costs. Countries thus have strong incentives to free ride, receiving the benefits of risk reduction without contributing. As a result, too few do what is in the common interest. Secondly, as already suggested above, existential risk reduction is an intergenerational public good: most of the benefits are enjoyed by future generations who have no say in the political process. For these goods, the problem is temporal free riding: the current generation enjoys the benefits of inaction while future generations bear the costs. Thirdly, many existential risks, such as machine superintelligence, engineered pandemics, and solar geoengineering, pose an unprecedented and uncertain future threat. Consequently, it is hard to develop a satisfactory governance regime for them: there are few existing governance instruments which can be applied to these risks, and it is unclear what shape new instruments should take. In this way, our position with regard to these emerging risks is comparable to the one we faced when nuclear weapons first became available. Cognitive biases also lead people to underestimate existential risks. Since there have not been any catastrophes of this magnitude, these risks are not salient to politicians and the public.72 This is an example of the misapplication of the availability heuristic, a mental shortcut which assumes that something is important only if it can be readily recalled. Another cognitive bias affecting perceptions of existential risk is scope neglect. In a seminal 1992 study, three groups were asked how much they would be willing to pay to save 2,000, 20,000 or 200,000 birds from drowning in uncovered oil ponds. The groups answered $80, $78, and $88, respectively.73 In this case, the size of the benefits had little effect on the scale of the preferred response. People become numbed to the effect of saving lives when the numbers get too large. 74 Scope neglect is a particularly acute problem for existential risk because the numbers at stake are so large. Due to scope neglect, decision-makers are prone to treat existential risks in a similar way to problems which are less severe by many orders of magnitude. A wide range of other cognitive biases are likely to affect the evaluation of existential risks.75

#### Weigh consequences.

Hirschel-Burns 16—PhD Student in Political Science @ Yale (Danny, In Defense of Consequentialism: A Response to Shadi Hamid," Apr 19, 2016, <https://thewideninglens.wordpress.com/2016/04/19/in-defense-of-consequentialism-a-response-to-shadi-hamid/>)

My difference of opinion is fundamental: I believe most US foreign policy to be short-sighted, and consequentialism, or the weighing of long-term ramifications against the initial intended effect of a particularly intervention to represent the ideal method of policymaking. Policies cannot solely be judged on intention, due to the frequency with which good intentions produce negative outcomes, nor can they be judged solely on initial effects due to the long-running causal chains produced by order-altering things like military interventions. However, Hamid is right that it is impossible to foresee some ramifications (even if we can see general correlations) of foreign policy, but he doesn’t apply that standard of doubt consistently across his analysis. Early in the essay, Hamid makes the point that to evaluate the Libyan intervention, it is necessary to compare the current situation with the counterfactual: what would Libya look like if the US hadn’t intervened. In general, the assertion is correct, but the practice of counterfactuals is tricky. Hamid’s analysis of where the Libyan conflict was at when the US intervened is enlightening, but his conclusion that Libya would likely look like Syria today had the US not intervened is highly questionable. Political prediction, especially on rare events like mass atrocities or civil wars, is really, really hard. And when you consider all the differences between Libya and Syria (total population, population density, salience of sectarian divides, regime configuration, military capability of opposition, etc.) along with all contingencies that could have occurred in the past four years, it is impossible to say with any certainty that Libya would bear a resemblance to Syria. Syria is merely a convenient standard of comparison because it’s an ongoing civil war in the Middle East, but saying Libya would be Syria doesn’t actually tell us that much about Libya or the effects of intervention. It’s not that the intervention can’t be justified with counterfactuals, but they need to be more carefully constructed. The central thrust of Hamid’s essay is to deride what he calls consequentialism, or evaluating the efficacy of foreign policy based on events years after the initial intervention in the target location. For Hamid, such an approach is particularly problematic because it a policy cannot be retroactively deemed a mistake if the limited goal of the intervention is achieved initially. Therefore consequentialism creates an impossibly high bar for foreign policy decisions: unless a foreign policy results in a peaceful, liberal democracy, than it’s a failure. This is, however, a major straw man. Certainly there are some critics that would deem the Libyan intervention a failure based on this standard, but Hamid lumps in those with reasonable concerns that a civil war (likely to continue for many years based on what we know about civil wars and foreign intervention) at least partially produced by the NATO intervention will have more negative long-term effects on Libyans than Gaddafi’s intended repression. Worrying about consequences does not preclude making foreign policy decisions. Recognizing that every decision has potential positive and negative effects is no more than an accurate framework for analyzing policy. There are an additional two problems with Hamid’s argument here. First, the dismissal of consequentialism is one of the central dynamics that leads Western policymakers to struggle with conflict prevention. Short-term thinking produces short-term solutions. Policymakers become trapped in a vicious circle of continual crises that overwhelm them and prevent longer-term thinking that could go a long way in preventing violence. Second, Hamid’s insistence that the initial moral righteousness of an intervention negates any negative effects, is deeply problematic. As many before me have argued, focusing only on moral imperatives disincentives careful planning and allows policymakers to wash their hands of responsibility if the situation starts to go south. Evaluating military interventions isn’t personal morality, because very rarely can doing the right thing in your personal life lead to deaths of thousands of people. Afghanistan is a valid example. The United States was going after the Taliban in response to 9/11 initially, but the war has had disastrous long-term effects for the country. It would take quite a bit of chutzpah to declare it a success. Moral arguments without strategic and humanitarian (writ large) considerations are also prone to abuse, because liberal interventionists and neoconservatives aren’t actually that far apart: both believe in the wisdom of Western democracies to improve the world through military force. Without more consequentialist standards, there’s not a clear line the prevents Iraq-like decisions. So Hamid’s own argument that Obama being right about Iraq decreases his likelihood he’ll be right about other situations is undermined by a lack of a standard that allows leaders to tell the difference between the two.

#### Predictions of extinction impacts are accurate and valuable.

Gleditsch 12 (Kristian S. Gleditsch, Department of Government, University of Essex & Peace Research Institute Oslo, and Michael D. Ward, Department of Political Science, Duke, 2012, “Forecasting is difficult, especially about the future: Using contentious issues to forecast interstate disputes,” Journal of Peace Research, 50(1) 17–31, Sage Journals)  
There have been remarkably few efforts to generate global forecasts or risk profiles for interstate conflict. Moreover, the most prominent efforts to consider the predictive ability of models of interstate conflicts have based their research on models that were not actually proposed with forecasting in mind. A notable example here is Beck, King & Zeng (2000), who essentially adopt the so-called liberal peace model of Russett & Oneal (2001). Certainly, nothing akin to the Political Instability Task Force’s now annual projections (beginning with Gurr, Marshall & Khosla, 2000) exists for international conflicts. Perhaps not surprisingly, many observers are very skeptical of the ability of academic researchers to anticipate conflict between states, at least beyond very short time horizons. Research in recent decades has seen a large number of hypotheses generated to explain under what conditions militarized interstate conflict is more or less likely. This avenue of research has been primarily inspired by research on the so-called democratic peace, or the absence of conflict between democracies. Indeed, there are thousands of scholarly works mentioning the term militarized interstate dispute (MID), most of which use these data for some kind of empirical examination of a proposition about disputes. Yet, the evidence suggests that the ability of this body of work to forecast conflict out-of-sample is decidedly disappointing. Ward, Siverson & Cao (2007) found that most of the recent statistical studies of militarized interstate disputes in prominent political science and international relations journals were unable to predict the outbreak of a single dispute out-of-sample (see also Beck, King & Zeng, 2000). Many researchers have sought to improve on the ability to forecast militarized interstate conflict by turning to alternative statistical methods. Beck, King & Zeng (2000), for example, find that neural networks perform marginally better than generalized linear regression models in forecasting conflict from the same input factors.1 Changes in estimation methods or statistical techniques per se, however, have at best led only to limited improvements in out-of-sample predictive ability. Our argument is that simply identifying inappropriate methods as the key source of the problem in forecasting conflict may give us the wrong diagnosis and lead us down less productive avenues. A more fundamental problem is models that provide a poor basis for forecasting by disregarding the motives for conflict to arise, or by only considering motives in a relatively superficial manner. Models that have been proposed for research on the democratic peace, notably the work of Russett & Oneal (2001), are primarily intended to examine whether certain characteristics of liberal institutions, such as democracy and trade, make conflict on average less likely relative to baseline risks of conflict. Although these approaches may be appropriate for testing the original propositions of interest, they essentially ignore the contentious issues that might cause states to resort to violence and instead treat these contentious issues as exogenous features, typically hidden inside a so-called ‘black box’ of the baseline risk of conflict. Our own initial foray into out-of-sample prediction for a state-level model indicates that spatial information about other conflict events can help to improve forecasts (see Ward & Gleditsch, 2002). Although this allows predictions of conflict to be conditional on other observed events rather than treating each conflict as an independent observation, the approach still ignores the issues over which such conflicts may have arisen initially. We believe that greater attention to the specific reasons for the occurrence of conflicts and the incompatibilities that may generate the use of violence can help improve our ability to forecast conflict. Although we recognize that different models may be appropriate to evaluate particular propositions and to forecast events, in our view the enterprise of prediction has great potential for winnowing bad ideas out of theories on the causes of conflict and avoiding the problem of retrospective biases in conventional hypothesis testing on the data used to develop the hypotheses in the first place (see Ward, Greenhill & Bakke, 2010). In fairness, much of the existing work on the statistical modeling of conflict has bypassed motivation since it is genuinely difficult to establish what states fight over and what their possible motivation for fighting might be. Nevertheless, the fact that something is difficult to evaluate does not mean that simply ignoring it is the best course of action. Another tradition in research on conflict has sought to identify incompatibilities in terms of contentious issues, such as territorial or maritime claims (Diehl, 1992; Mansbach & Vasquez, 1981). Recent efforts to examine these propositions empirically have found considerable evidence that cases where such claims exist are more likely to see militarized activities (Hensel, 2001; Hensel et al., 2008; Hensel & Mitchell, 2010). Even so, at present this line of research has primarily engaged in testing hypotheses about whether coefficient estimates are significantly different from 0 or the in-sample post-diction of conflicts, and has not yet examined if information on contentious issues may be helpful for forecasting dyadic conflict out-of-sample. Here we explicitly consider whether taking into account information on contentious issues and conflict management can help improve on forecasting interstate conflict and our understanding of conflict dynamics. Although we focus on statistical approaches to interstate conflict in this article, many of our arguments also apply to problems in traditional theories of conflict and qualitative approaches to prediction or anticipating political events (see Tetlock, 2005). Traditional theories of interstate conflict tend to focus on structural features presumed to influence the opportunities for conflict such as the distribution of power in the international system or relative balance of power (see e.g. Waltz, 1979). These theories display little interest in the specific incompatibilities that may motivate the use of violence. However, structural factors rarely change rapidly, but violent conflict tends to be episodic, and hence cannot be adequately explained merely by reference to permissive conditions (see Fearon, 1995). Likewise, our core argument applies to studies of civil war, which tend to emphasize opportunities for conflict rather than motivations for conflict (see Cederman, Weidmann & Gleditsch, 2011), and where evidence for the predictive ability of existing statistical efforts seems similarly disappointing (see Ward, Greenhill & Bakke, 2010). Many political and area study experts, typically using informal methods for deriving predictions, often have strong confidence in their ability to forecast events. However, the comprehensive series of studies by Tetlock (2005), who asked experts to rate a series of outcomes which could then be compared against the historical record, provide little support for the forecasting ability of political experts.
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#### Integration between pharma and biotech is accelerating, unlocking innovation.

Cancherini ’21 [Laura; April 30; Consultant in McKinsey’s Brussels office; McKinsey, “What’s ahead for biotech: Another wave or low tide?” https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/whats-ahead-for-biotech-another-wave-or-low-tide]

Fundamentals continue strong

When we asked executives and investors why the biotech sector had stayed so resilient during the worst economic crisis in decades, they cited innovation as the main reason. The number of assets transitioning to clinical phases is still rising, and further waves of innovation are on the horizon, driven by the convergence of biological and technological advances.

In the present day, many biotechs, along with the wider pharmaceutical industry, are taking steps to address the COVID-19 pandemic. Together, biotechs and pharma companies have [more than 250 vaccine candidates in their pipelines](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/on-pins-and-needles-will-covid-19-vaccines-save-the-world), along with a similar number of therapeutics. What’s more, the crisis has shone a spotlight on pharma as the public seeks to understand the roadblocks involved in delivering a vaccine at speed and the measures needed to maintain safety and efficacy standards. To that extent, the world has been living through a time of mass education in science research and development.

Biotech has also benefited from its innate financial resilience. Healthcare as a whole is less dependent on economic cycles than most other industries. Biotech is an innovator, actively identifying and addressing patients’ unmet needs. In addition, biotechs’ top-line revenues have been less affected by lockdowns than is the case in most other industries.

Another factor acting in the sector’s favor is that larger pharmaceutical companies still rely on biotechs as a source of innovation. With the [top dozen pharma companies](https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/m-and-a/our-insights/a-new-prescription-for-m-and-a-in-pharma) having more than $170 billion in excess reserves that could be available for spending on M&A, the prospects for further financing and deal making look promising.

For these and other reasons, many investors regard biotech as a safe haven. One interviewee felt it had benefited from a halo effect during the pandemic.

More innovation on the horizon

The investors and executives we interviewed agreed that biotech innovation continues to increase in quality and quantity despite the macroeconomic environment. Evidence can be seen in the accelerating pace of assets transitioning across the development lifecycle. When we tracked the number of assets transitioning to Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III clinical trials, we found that Phase I and Phase II assets have transitioned 50 percent faster since 2018 than between 2013 and 2018, whereas Phase III assets have maintained much the same pace. There could be many reasons for this, but it is worth noting that biotechs with Phase I and Phase II assets as their lead assets have accounted for more than half of biotech IPOs. Having an early IPO gives a biotech earlier access to capital and leaves it with more scope to concentrate on science.

Looking forward, the combination of advances in biological science and accelerating developments in technology and artificial intelligence has the potential to take innovation to a new level. A [recent report](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/the-bio-revolution-innovations-transforming-economies-societies-and-our-lives) from the McKinsey Global Institute analyzed the profound economic and social impact of biological innovation and found that biomolecules, biosystems, biomachines, and biocomputing could collectively produce up to 60 percent of the physical inputs to the global economy. The applications of this “Bio Revolution” range from agriculture (such as the production of nonanimal meat) to energy and materials, and from consumer goods (such as multi-omics tailored diets) to a multitude of health applications.

#### Patent law is a battering ram for innovation and chills patent stability.

Mosoff et al. ’19 [Adam, Kristen Osenga, Randall Rader, Mark Schultz, and Saurabh Vishnubhakat; January 28; Professor of Law at George Mason University; Regulatory Transparency Project, “How Antitrust Overreach is Threatening Healthcare Innovation,” <https://regproject.org/paper/how-antitrust-overreach-is-threatening-healthcare-innovation/>]

II. The FTC’s Heavy-Handed Meddling Upsets the Delicate Balance Between Branded and Generic Drug Companies, Hindering Innovation and Harming Consumers

Since the late 1990s, the FTC has devoted substantial resources to combating what it views as anticompetitive behavior on the part of drug companies in the healthcare market. The FTC has interposed its scrutiny even where the FDA has approved drugs and when the branded and generic companies have decided a legal fight is no longer worth having. The FTC’s meddling restricts behavior that is lawful under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FDCA). The FTC’s meddling also usurps the regime Congress carefully crafted for resolving patent disputes between branded and generic drug companies.

The FTC has devised a series of novel theories to justify treating lawful behavior as anticompetitive and worthy of enforcement action and legislative changes. These theories have been adopted—and adapted—by state antitrust enforcers as well as private antitrust plaintiffs. The FTC has conducted industry-wide investigations and prepared massive reports on supposed anticompetitive conduct to recommend legislative changes despite neither the branded nor generic drug industry seeking such changes. These changes to the law would restrict or punish patent owners and even patent challengers. The FTC has, on its own initiative, made the already volatile world of drug development more uncertain and more hostile, ultimately resulting in less innovation and fewer choices for consumers in the short term (e.g., generic options) and long term (e.g., new drugs).

The FTC’s aggression extends to the courtroom. For nearly two decades, the FTC and other antitrust plaintiffs have attacked patent settlements reached by branded and generic drug companies. As explained above, the regulatory scheme for new drugs gives rise to an unusual type of patent litigation in which the generic drug company—the defendant—is not at risk of money damages for infringement because litigation generally occurs before the generic drug has obtained FDA approval and enters the market. Because of this unusual arrangement, where each side had to yield something of value to the other at the settlement table, a patent owner occasionally pays a settlement to the defendant (rather than forgiveness of damages, which is typically not an option) in exchange for the defendant agreeing to slightly delay the launch of its generic drug. Other considerations, such as the generic company agreeing to source materials from the branded company or other business or research partnerships, are not uncommon.

Beginning in the 1990s, the FTC took the position that such settlements were a categorically illegal restraint of trade. Courts did not agree, as modern antitrust jurisprudence recognizes that declaring something categorically illegal in the absence of more facts and details is dubious. Courts generally concluded that a settlement within the scope of the patent—where the defendant agreed to remain off the market no more than already required by the patent but perhaps longer than a successful court challenge—did not itself violate the antitrust laws. Yet the FTC persisted in arguing its position to the Supreme Court. In the 2013 Actavis case, the Supreme Court declined the FTC’s invitation to find reverse payment settlements categorically anticompetitive, ruling instead that these settlements must be evaluated under antitrust law’s “rule of reason,”, which is a detailed look at all the relevant facts and circumstances of the individual case.7 Still undeterred in the wake of Actavis, the FTC continues to argue that a variety of patent settlements are anticompetitive and accuse district courts of misinterpreting Actavis.

The FTC’s basic position is that antitrust scrutiny is triggered when the patent owner offers anything of value beyond the litigation expenses that settlement would save. Any patent owner who tries to entice a generic competitor to settle by offering anything more than litigation costs is treated suspiciously by the FTC. Even if the settlement is a complex corporate transaction that involves manufacturing and promotion deals or other products—where both parties might benefit beyond merely the ending of a lawsuit—the FTC’s basic position is to presume an antitrust violation.

Not surprisingly, the FTC’s overzealous actions against drug makers make it very difficult to settle pharmaceutical patent litigation without branded and generic drug companies both expecting an antitrust case, which may itself end up effectively revisiting the patent issues the parties sought to move beyond by settling. Companies still try to craft agreements that eliminate the risk that both face in litigation while ensuring that generic market entry occurs well before patent expiry, but no matter the terms, the FTC stands ready to argue that the companies should not have settled. In the end, these parties seem to want patent litigation cases to continue to final judgment, even when this is not in the interest of the branded companies, generic drug companies, consumers or the federal court system.

The FTC has also started to interfere with the ordinary cycle of incremental innovation in the drug industry. Incremental drug innovation is both commonplace and can be medically important. New dosage forms and routes of administration can make life-sustaining drugs easier to administer to new populations. New formulations, such as extended release formulations, can simplify dosing, thus increasing patient compliance.

In recent years, however, the FTC has targeted these patents. The chief complaint advanced by the FTC is that incremental innovations are trivial advances and do not deserve patent protection. Where the branded company replaces an older version of its product with the patented new version, the FTC accuses the branded company of “product hopping” to force the market to move to new drugs. The problem with this argument is threefold. First, these innovations have satisfied the requirements of the Patent Act. Second, if they are indeed trivial, the patents will likely be held invalid in federal court when challenged by generic competitors.  Third, if the branded company’s new product does not provide better outcomes, insurers are unlikely to cover the product and will instead require a patient to use the generic version of the branded company’s first product. The FTC’s actions are thus a solution in search of a problem.

Conclusion

The FTC’s goals may be well-intentioned, but its intrusion into domains that other, more expert agencies already oversee and comprehensively regulate is troubling. By substituting its own agenda for the business judgment of sophisticated parties in the marketplace, the FTC has overreached its proper role and begun to disrupt the cycle of investment, product development, recoupment, further incremental advancement, and risk management that drives the creation of new drugs that save lives and promote greater public health.

#### Innovation optimizes synthetic biology---extinction.

Karoui et al. ’19 [Meriem, Monica Hoyos-Flight, and Liz Fletcher; August 7; Centre for Synthetic and Systems Biology in the School of Biological Sciences at the University of Edinburgh; Innogen Institute in the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Edinburgh; Frontiers, “Future Trends in Synthetic Biology—A Report,” <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fbioe.2019.00175/full>]

Tackling Risk

Synthetic biology is an example of a dual-use technology: it promises numerous beneficial applications, but it can also cause harm. This has led to fears that it could, intentionally or unintentionally, harm humans or damage the environment. For example, there is huge value in our ability to engineer viruses to be more effective and specific shuttles for gene therapies of devastating inherited disorders; however, engineering viruses may also lead to the creation of even more deadly pathogens by those intent on harm.

“Synthetic biology should be regarded as an extension of earlier developments and technologies”

Some would argue that synthetic biology poses an existential risk and needs to be treated with extreme caution. However, many new technological advances across the decades have met similar concerns. The uncertainty and remote possibility of such risks could hamper the development of useful technology. Scientists, their host institutions and funding bodies should (and indeed already do) consider whether the research planned could be misused. Measures that reduce the likelihood of misuse and its consequences should be implemented and clearly communicated. The synthetic biology community needs to be aware of, and respond to, these challenges by engaging in horizon scanning exercises as well as open dialogue with regulatory bodies and the media.

“Don't avoid risk – manage it”

Being more open about risks, and how they are controlled, provides an opportunity to shift discourse toward the benefits of synthetic biology in addressing urgent global needs, such as the production of biofuels, food security and more effective medicines, and potentially improve public acceptance.

“The questions should not be ‘what’s the next big thing for synthetic biology' but ‘where is the greatest unmet need’.”

Despite the efforts by individual countries to establish synthetic biology research roadmaps, broader, international agreement on common standards (and red lines) across the field may help establish trust and to advance the best pre-competitive research into useful applications.

Meeting participants highlighted the importance of training in responsible research conduct and ethics. Given students' future role as science ambassadors and influencers, their training should not only convey skills and knowledge but also awareness and critical thinking about the prospects and potential for dual use of synthetic biology. All researchers must remain vigilant regardless of the many pressures and distractions of running a successful research lab; they may not have specialist training in identifying the risks of misuse but they are the people best placed to maintain informed oversight of risks.

One example of current synthetic biology research with potential dual use is gene drive technology, which can be used to propagate a particular suite of genes throughout a population. The benefits of using gene drive technology include the eradication of disease-carrying insect populations and the elimination of invading pest species but it has raised concerns about the unintended ecological impacts of reducing or eliminating a population ([Callaway, 2018](https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fbioe.2019.00175/full#B5); [Collins, 2018](https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fbioe.2019.00175/full#B9)).

Similar release concerns surround research that is harnessing the ability of pathogens to target particular tissues in the body or particular chemicals in the environment, which could greatly aid efforts to deliver targeted therapies or clean-up contaminated sites. To date, such large-scale release for environmental bioremediation interventions has not been possible.

“We need to mind the gap between R&D scale up and communications …. One bad blog can kill a commercial product”

There was consensus that the need for regulation over this community remains important. Regulation needs to keep up to speed with the emerging technologies and should focus on the product rather than the process used to create it ([Tait et al., 2017](https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fbioe.2019.00175/full#B34)). Unsuitable regulatory frameworks (as well as unfavorable public perception) could discourage private sector investment in synthetic biology.
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#### Debt limit and government funding will pass now—everything else is delayed

BRESNAHAN 9/15 [JOHN BRESNAHAN, ANNA PALMER AND JAKE SHERMAN, Punchbowl News Legislataive Outlook 9/15, https://email.punchbowl.news/t/ViewEmailArchive/t/E48C6AF0C3714E452540EF23F30FEDED/C67FD2F38AC4859C/]

As we’ve been writing for you in Punchbowl News AM, we’re in the middle of the busiest legislative period in years. September has a stunning number of fiscal and legislative deadlines. The biggest of these, of course, is the end of the fiscal year on Sept. 30. This issue has become caught up in the debt-limit debate as Democrats plan to attach a debt-limit increase to a short-term funding bill. Republicans have vowed to oppose this move, raising the risk for the two sides to blunder into a government shutdown or debt crisis.

Suddenly, the Democrats’ $3.5 trillion reconciliation package and the $1 trillion bipartisan Senate infrastructure bill -- long the top priority in D.C. -- are taking a back seat to the meat and potatoes of governing. It now seems at least somewhat likely that the “Build Back Better” agenda -- made up of infrastructure and social safety net measures proposed by President Joe Biden -- could be delayed until later this fall.

One theory among Democrats is that Republicans will cave -- if not initially, then after a brief government shutdown or debt default scare during which the Democrats win the political argument that the GOP is an irresponsible partner in governing. Good luck getting someone to say that on the record, but it’s the reality we hear privately in the Capitol.
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#### Medical IP takes time, energy, and political capital away from domestic legislation – big pharma and EU allies

Bhadrakumar 5/9 M K Bhadrakumar is a former Indian diplomat. "Biden’s talk of vaccine IP waiver is political theater." Asia Times, May 9, 2021, asiatimes.com/2021/05/bidens-talk-of-vaccine-ip-waiver-is-political-theater.

On the other hand, Biden, whose political life of half a century was largely spent in the US Congress, is well aware of the awesome clout of the pharmaceutical companies in American politics. From that lobby’s perspective, the patent waiver “amounts to the expropriation of the property of the pharmaceutical companies whose innovation and financial investments made the development of Covid-19 vaccines possible in the first place,” as a senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security puts it. The US pharmaceutical industry and congressional Republicans have already gone on the offensive blasting Biden’s announcement, saying it undermines incentives for American innovation. Besides, the argument goes, even with the patent waiver, vaccine manufacturing is a complex process and is not like simply flipping a switch. Senator Richard Burr, the top Republican on the US Senate Health Committee, denounced Biden’s decision. “Intellectual property protections are part of the reason we have these life-saving products,” he said. “Stripping these protections only ensures we won’t have the vaccines or treatments we need when the next pandemic occurs.” The Republican senators backed by Republican Study Committee chairman Jim Banks propose to introduce legislation to block the move. Clearly, Biden would rather spend his political capital on getting the necessary legislation through Congress to advance his domestic reform agenda rather than spend time and energy to take on the pharmaceutical industry to burnish his image as a good Samaritan on the world stage. Conceivably, Biden could be counting on the “text-based negotiations” at the WTO dragging on for months, if not years, without reaching anywhere. The US support for the waiver could even be a tactic to persuade pharmaceutical firms to back less drastic steps like sharing technology and expanding joint ventures to boost global production quickly. So far Covid-19 vaccines have been distributed primarily to the wealthy countries that developed them, while the pandemic sweeps through poorer ones such as India, and the real goal is, after all, expanded vaccine distribution. Biden is well aware that there will be huge opposition to the TRIPS waiver from the United States’ European allies as well. The British press has reported that the UK has been in closed-door talks at the World Trade Organization in recent months along with the likes of Australia, Canada, Japan, Norway, Singapore, the European Union and the US, who all opposed the idea.

#### Agenda change has a cascading effect

Joly 19, [Jeroen Joly is a Doctor Assistant at Universiteit Gent, Punctuated equilibrium theory and foreign policy, The research for this chapter was financially supported by the French Ministry of the Armed Forces, Directorate General for International Relations and Strategy (DGRIS), https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jeroen\_Joly/publication/331073786\_Punctuated\_equilibrium\_theory\_and\_foreign\_policy/links/5c66ec3092851c1c9de446f2/Punctuated-equilibrium-theory-and-foreign-policy.pdf]

Further Theorization of Existing Concepts

Finally, agenda-setting scholars have continued to improve our understanding of some mechanisms and key concepts of PET. Several agenda-setting studies, for example, examined how friction and cascading contribute to the typical pattern of policy punctuations. Cascading is best understood as a self-reinforcing process of positive feedback whereby attention from one actor generates attention from another actor, which, again, draws even more attention from the initial actor, overthrowing the existing friction mechanisms (Jones and Baumgartner 2005; Walgrave and Vliegenthart 2010). Looking at mass media and parliament, Walgrave and Vliegenthart (2010) found friction and cascading to operate independently from each other to create punctuations, and showed under which conditions these mechanisms are more likely to occur.

The notion of cascading closely relates to the wider agenda-setting literature examining how attention from one actor influences that of another. We know, for example, that political parties heavily influence each other regarding the issues they focus on in parliament (Vliegenthart et al. 2011). Several studies have also confirmed the mutual influence between news media, parliament and government influence in the issues they focus on (for a comprehensive review of the literature on the media’s influence on parliament and government, see Van Aelst and Walgrave (2016) and Walgrave et al. (2006)), also for foreign policy issues (Edwards and Wood 1999; Wood and Peake 1998).

#### Debt default is the easiest way to wreck the US economy—ruins the US dollar and financial reputation

Egan 9/8 [Matt Egan is an award-winning reporter at CNN, covering business, the economy and financial markets across CNN's television and digital platforms, "'Financial Armageddon.' What's at stake if the debt limit isn't raised", 9/8/21, <https://www.cnn.com/2021/09/08/business/debt-ceiling-default-explained/index.html>]

The easiest way to spark a financial crisis and wreck the US economy would be to allow the federal government to default on its debt. It would be an epic, unforced error — and millions of Americans would pay the price.

And yet that unlikely situation is once again being contemplated. If Congress doesn't raise the limit on federal borrowing the federal government will most likely run out of cash and extraordinary measures next month, Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen warned lawmakers on Wednesday.

In short, a default would be an economic cataclysm. Interest rates would spike, the stock market would crater, retirement accounts would take a beating, the value of the US dollar would erode and the financial reputation of the world's only superpower would be tarnished.

"It would be financial Armageddon," Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics, told CNN. "It's complete craziness to even contemplate the idea of not paying our debt on time."

But it's a crazy world.

Lawmakers in Washington are again playing chicken with America's creditworthiness. And the path to raising the debt ceiling is not clear.

Even though Congress has in the past raised the debt ceiling with a bipartisan vote, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell vowed in July that Republicans will not vote to raise the debt ceiling.

JPMorgan Chase (JPM) CEO Jamie Dimon urged lawmakers not to even think about going down this path again. During a hearing in May, Dimon said an actual default "could cause an immediate, literally cascading catastrophe of unbelievable proportions and damage America for 100 years."

'Irreparable damage'

In her letter to Congress, Yellen said history shows that waiting "until the last minute" to suspend or increase the debt limit "can cause serious harm" to business and consumer confidence, raise borrowing costs for taxpayers and hurt America's credit rating.

"A delay that calls into question the federal government's ability to meet all its obligations would likely cause irreparable damage to the U.S. economy and global financial markets," Yellen wrote.

A US default would undermine the bedrock of the modern global financial system.

"We pay our debt. That's what distinguishes the United States from almost every other country on the planet," Zandi of Moody's said.

Because of America's long track record of paying its debt, it's very cheap for Washington to borrow. But a default would force ratings companies to downgrade US debt and shatter that borrowing advantage. Markets plunged in 2011 when that debt ceiling standoff caused Standard & Poor's to downgrade America's credit rating.

Higher borrowing costs would make it much harder for Washington to borrow to pay for infrastructure, the climate crisis or to fight future recessions. And refinancing America's nearly $29 trillion mountain of existing debt would become that much more expensive. Interest expenses, which totaled $345 billion in fiscal 2020, would quickly rival what Washington spends on defense.

#### Extinction

Joshua Zoffer 20, Investor at Cove Hill Partners, Fellow at New America, JD Candidate at Yale University Law School, AB from Harvard University, “To End Forever War, Keep the Dollar Globally Dominant”, The New Republic, 2/3/2020, https://newrepublic.com/article/156417/end-forever-war-keep-dollar-globally-dominant

In early 2016, Obama Treasury Secretary Jack Lew cautioned that the dollar’s dominance as a global currency rested, in part, on the U.S. government’s reluctance to fully weaponize it. If foreign markets and governments “feel that we will deploy sanctions without sufficient justification or for inappropriate reasons,” he warned, “we should not be surprised if they look for ways to avoid doing business in the United States or in U.S. dollars.” Lew’s case stemmed from the more fundamental view that the dollar’s international role is “a source of tremendous strength for our economy, a benefit for U.S. companies and a driver of U.S. global leadership”—in other words, a role worth keeping. This view is emblematic of American financial governance since the Second World War. U.S. economic analysts, especially at the Treasury, have jealously guarded the dollar’s role and the many benefits it offers: the ability to run large deficits at low cost and disproportionate influence over the structure of the global economy, among others. Yet in their recent article in The New Republic, David Adler and Daniel Bessner argue the U.S. should abandon these advantages. In their view, the dollar’s role has encouraged American militarism and should be relinquished to curb such behavior. Dollar hegemony is not without cost, but to renounce it would be a profound mistake. Adler and Bessner’s view neglects the sizable economic benefits the dollar’s role confers on the U.S., as well as its possible use as an antidote to military adventurism. It ignores the enormous good that can be done with deficit spending, much of which has gone to the American military but could instead fund progressive programs. And it elides the inability of the U.S. and its global trading partners to shift away from dollar dominance without creating worldwide financial distress. Adler and Bessner are right that the U.S. has misused its privilege, but Washington should not abandon it; rather, American leaders should seek to transform it. Generations of American policymakers have been right to protect the dollar’s key currency role for economic reasons. Most notably, dollar hegemony affords the U.S. the ability to run large and prolonged budget and balance-of-payments deficits. The dollar represents 62 percent of allocated foreign exchange reserves, is used to invoice and settle roughly half of world trade, and accounts for 42 percent of global payments. Because governments, banks, and businesses worldwide need lots of dollars, the world market always stands ready to absorb new U.S.-dollar-denominated debt without charging higher interest rates. Adler and Bessner correctly point out that the rest of the world considers the dollar’s role as the world’s reserve currency to be an “exorbitant privilege,” a term coined in the 1960s by then French Finance Minister Valéry Giscard D’Estaing. The ability to spend beyond its means has enabled the U.S. to fund its impressive military might, whether one views that power as the fountainhead of Pax Americana or the source of illegitimate military adventurism. But these economic benefits go beyond just deficits. The demand for dollars also pushes up the dollar’s value against other currencies, enhancing American purchasing power and offering consumers access to imports on the cheap. The dollar’s role also means American firms rarely need to do business in foreign currencies, reducing transaction costs and exchange-rate risks. More broadly, America’s central economic role gives it outsize influence at crucial moments. At the height of the financial crisis that began in 2008, the Federal Reserve was able to inject vital liquidity into the global financial system by selectively offering dollar swap lines to trusted foreign central banks. Dollar hegemony enabled the U.S. to act swiftly, effectively, and on its own terms. In addition, the dollar’s role offers a potent alternative to kinetic military action as a means of pursuing foreign policy objectives. The dollar’s broad use means access to dollar liquidity—which in turn requires access to the U.S. financial system—is essential for foreign governments and businesses. For foreign banks, especially, being cut off from dollar access is essentially a death sentence. That makes sanctions that do so a powerful tool in the international arena. In 2005, for example, the U.S. used the dollar to strike a devastating blow against North Korea without firing a single shot or even formally enacting sanctions. Using authority provided by Section 311 of the Patriot Act, the Department of the Treasury crippled Banco Delta Asia, a bank accused of facilitating illegal activity by the North Korean government, by merely threatening to cut off its access to the American financial system. Deposit outflows began within days; within weeks the bank was placed under government administration to avoid a full collapse. Pyongyang was hit hard, as other banks ceased their business with it to avoid meeting the same fate. Similarly, though the Trump administration has worked hard to undo it, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran to limit the development of nuclear weapons was made possible, in part, by painful dollar sanctions that brought Iran to the table. Far from being a proximate cause of military conflict, the dollar’s central global role has often been used to contain adversaries without military intervention. Still, skeptics are right to point out that the dollar’s role has indirectly funded American interventionism and that dollar sanctions have been overused, provoking the ire of American allies. But these facts suggest we should use our dollar power to forge a more progressive U.S. order, not abandon the advantage altogether. America’s exorbitant privilege need not fund warships and missiles: The same low-interest borrowing could be used to fund a new universal health care system, expand access to higher education, or pursue any number of large-scale social policy objectives, including financing global public goods that no other country or consortium of countries is prepared to fund, such as climate change mitigation.