**Fwk-**

**The standard is maximizing expected well-being, defined as promoting the most good for the greatest number of people.**

**Prefer it for two reasons:**

**1] Actor spec- states can't focus on each person individually, which requires they act on generalities**

**2] death o/w- forecloses possibility for any future moral goodness. sv doesn't matter if ur dead :(**

**Contention 1: Pharma Innovation**

**Pharmaceutical innovation is high now, and it’s sustained by continued monetary incentives**

**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](https://www.cbo.goc/publication/57126) TCHS-CS

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.**

**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>] TCHS-CS

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 in favor of **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**.

**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) TCHS-CS

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 **r**esearch and **d**evelopment **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**.

#### **This impact is damning- future pandemics will be worse and cause mass death AT LEAST.**

**Pamlin and Armstrong 15** (Dennis Pamlin: Executive Project Manager Global Risks, Global Challenges Foundation. Stuart Armstrong: James Martin Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford. February 15, “12 Risks that threaten human civilisation: The case for a new risk category”, Global Challenges Foundation, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291086909_12_Risks_that_threaten_human_civilisation_The_case_for_a_new_risk_category> TCHS-CS

Infectious diseases have been one of the greatest causes of mortality in history. Unlike many other global challenges pandemics have happened recently, as we can see where reasonably good data exist. Plotting historic epidemic fatalities on a log scale reveals that these tend to follow a power law with a small exponent: many plagues have been found to follow a power law with exponent 0.26.261 These kinds of power laws are heavy-tailed262 to a significant degree.263 In consequence most of the fatalities are accounted for by the top few events.264 If this law holds for future pandemics as well,265 then the majority of people who will die from epidemics will likely die from the single largest pandemic. Most epidemic fatalities follow a power law, with some extreme events – such as the Black Death and Spanish Flu – being even more deadly.267 There are other grounds for suspecting that such a highimpact epidemic will have a greater probability than usually assumed. All the features of an extremely devastating disease already exist in nature: essentially incurable (Ebola268), nearly always fatal (rabies269), extremely infectious (common cold270), and long incubation periods (HIV271). If a pathogen were to emerge that somehow combined these features (and influenza has demonstrated antigenic shift, the ability to combine features from different viruses272), its death toll would be extreme. Many relevant features of the world have changed considerably, making past comparisons problematic. The modern world has better sanitation and medical research, as well as national and supra-national institutions dedicated to combating diseases. Private insurers are also interested in modelling pandemic risks.273 Set against this is the fact that modern transport and dense human population allow infections to spread much more rapidly274, and there is the potential for urban slums to serve as breeding grounds for disease.275 Unlike events such as nuclear wars, pandemics would not damage the world’s infrastructure, and initial survivors would likely be resistant to the infection. And there would probably be survivors, if only in isolated locations. Hence the risk of a civilisation collapse would come from the ripple effect of the fatalities and the policy responses. These would include political and agricultural disruption as well as economic dislocation and damage to the world’s trade network (including the food trade). Extinction risk is only possible if the aftermath of the epidemic fragments and diminishes human society to the extent that recovery becomes impossible277 before humanity succumbs to other risks (such as climate change or further pandemics).

**Contention 2: Intl Trade**

**The WTO is dying, but the IPR waiver saves it.**

**Stangler 9/10 -** Cole Stangler, 9-10, 11, Jacobin, Joe Biden Is Still Fighting a Vaccine Waiver for the Rest of the World, https://jacobinmag.com/2021/09/joe-biden-vaccine-waiver-global-ip-world-trade

In May, the Biden administration made a bombshell declaration, endorsing a call to temporarily suspend intellectual property (IP) rights on COVID vaccines that health and trade experts say could greatly improve access to shots in the Global South — a move that appeared to mark a turning point in the global fight against the pandemic. Months later, though, as **the pandemic rages** and **the glaring gap in vaccine access grows, the effort remains blocked at the** World Trade Organization **(WTO**). Any waiver for vaccines needs the green light from the organization’s TRIPS Council — the commission in charge of IP rights — and unanimous support from all 164 members. But as delegations return to Geneva after summer break, a long-circulated proposal backed by India and South Africa has yet to gain traction. Meanwhile, the Biden administration — which has deep ties to the pharmaceutical industry — has proven unwilling to share vaccine recipes with other countries, as we reported earlier this week. “It’s really upsetting watching this process,” says Hu Yuan Qiong, policy co-coordinator and senior legal and policy adviser for Doctors Without Borders’ Access Campaign. “Viruses disregard whatever game we’re playing in human society; they just carry on and mutate.” The deadlock is the product of multiple factors. Hostility from the United Kingdom and the European Union as well as criticism from Big Pharma have complicated efforts, but as experts tell us, so has the apparent unwillingness of the Biden administration to go beyond its four-month-old statement and actually start pressing for a waiver. “I’ve been working on trade policy for a while, and I know that when the United States wants something, they get it,” Burcu Kilic, a trade policy expert at Public Citizen, tells us. “The United States should [play] a proactive role in this discussion.” European Intransigence Amid Pharma’s Lobbying Blitz One immediate obstacle is the United Kingdom. As Hu from Doctors Without Borders says, Prime Minister Boris Johnson’s government has shown little interest in changing its position over the last few months. She says it’s effectively stuck to the talking points of AstraZeneca, pointing to the pharmaceutical company’s willingness to work with producers in the developing world as supposed evidence that a waiver is unnecessary. Appearing before the TRIPS Council in June, for instance, the British government argued that technology transfers and voluntary licensing “exemplified by the Oxford AstraZeneca vaccine” and its partnerships are “making real, positive impact.” In a statement, the UK said it was not “convinced how an IP waiver, if agreed, would increase the supply of COVID-19 goods.” Hu doesn’t buy it. “We’ve explained to them, ‘We’re not just talking about AstraZeneca vaccines, we’re talking about many vaccines and many treatments,’” she says of the UK. “Maybe a company like AstraZeneca has done a little bit more than another company, but that will not solve the global issue.” An ideal waiver on IP rights, she stresses, would also cover the two messenger RNA (mRNA) vaccines developed by Pfizer and Moderna, as well as medical equipment, technologies used for therapeutic treatment, and future vaccines. Lobbying disclosure regulations in the UK are relatively weak. Only lobbyists working for third-party firms are required to sign the country’s lobbying register, which, as a result, covers just a small fraction of the country’s lobbyists, most of whom are employed in-house. Still, British government departments are required to disclose information about meetings with external organizations — and, according to records compiled by Transparency International and consulted by us, no single external organization in the UK has met more with the British government since the beginning of 2021 than AstraZeneca. The Cambridge-based pharmaceutical giant beat out the country’s top business lobby, the Confederation of British Industry, and the Port of Dover, the massive seaport that has struggled to adjust to Brexit. In the meantime, the European Union also continues to oppose a proposed TRIPS waiver. While several national governments — including France and Spain — have said they support a waiver, what ultimately counts in Geneva is the stance of the EU’s executive branch, the European Commission. Rather than open up talks over the text backed by South Africa and India, the EU has offered up a separate proposal of its own, bogging down the discussion. EU officials maintain that a broad waiver on IP rights for vaccines doesn’t address the underlying problem of inadequate manufacturing capacity. According to this argument, even if producers in lower-income countries had the legal authority to start churning out COVID vaccines, they wouldn’t be able to, because they lack the factories or technological know-how. But Hu of Doctors Without Borders says that’s a red herring. Like many supporters of a temporary suspension in IP rights, she doesn’t claim a waiver will result in a transformation overnight. Instead, she views it as a launching pad to a scenario in which knowledge, data, and technology can flow more freely between states and manufacturers. “We can’t say, ‘Okay, you have a law,’ and then tomorrow start [producing]’ — it’s not going to happen that fast,” she explains. “But the earlier you open the door, the more certainty you can provide for the producers so they can prepare . . . the longer they don’t allow this door to open, the more problems we’ll face.”As we have previously reported, Big Pharma boasts a heavy presence in Brussels. Between March 2020 and May 2021, EU commissioners involved in medicine and vaccine issues met 140 times with pharmaceutical companies, and just once with an organization that supports a waiver on IP rights, according to the Corporate Europe Observatory, a watchdog group. Last year, Europe’s top pharmaceutical lobby spent more than €5.25 million on lobbying EU officials, the eighth-highest amount reported by any lobbying organization in the EU in 2020. For Hu, Big Pharma’s political influence helps explain the hostility from both London and Brussels to a waiver. “We strongly believe there is a direct correlation,” she says. Closely related political and ideological factors help drive pushback as well — especially when it comes to Europe’s largest economy and most prominent opponent of a waiver, Germany. The country is home to BioNTech, which developed the widely used mRNA shot alongside Pfizer. Even though the latter company has reaped most of the vaccine’s financial rewards, Burcu Kilic of Public Citizen says that officials in Berlin seem to regard vaccine development as a source of national pride. For many within Chancellor Angela Merkel’s ruling party, the Christian Democratic Union, there is a sense that lifting IP protections amounts to a slap in the face to national industry. “It goes beyond BioNTech,” Kilic says. “It’s about German inventions, German [small and midsize enterprises], Germany saving the world . . . it’s political, but it’s also emotional.” American Indifference Both Hu and Kilic argue the United States should be more aggressive — by putting pressure on its allies to back a waiver or, at the very least, by jump-starting serious negotiations. Up until now, the Biden administration has largely kept to the sidelines on the issue of IP rights. However, the US government may already have a strong case that it owns the IP on the Moderna vaccine, given its role in the shot’s development. The Biden administration could, in theory, share information about the dose with other producers — as the South Korean government has already requested. But even beyond the narrow issue of the Moderna shot, the American agency that negotiates trade policy, the United States Trade Representative (USTR), hasn’t issued a statement on the subject of a vaccine waiver since its widely celebrated declaration of support back in May. “That’s not usually what the United States or USTR does in these types of negotiations,” says Kilic from Public Citizen. “It’s like Lionel Messi saying, ‘I want to be in the World Cup,’ but then he’s not playing. You say you want a waiver, but you don’t do anything about it.” The USTR did not respond to a request for comment. In any case, the WTO’s TRIPS Council is slated to meet informally next week, on September 14. After weeks of inaction, that meeting could prove the impetus for progress, even if a full breakthrough doesn’t come until later in the year. Kilic remains optimistic that the deadlock will break. For one, she says political pressure is mounting on the United States, EU, and UK. But she also argues **the future of the WTO is at stake** — a fact that helps explain why the organization’s newly appointed director-general Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala has taken an active role in talks. **“In the last decade, the WTO became** a **nonfunctional** organization, and **there’s pressure** on the WTO and the WTO leadership **to do something** about that,” Kilic says. **“[The director-general] knows that if they let this go, this’ll be the end of the WTO.”**

**The WTO is key to international trade.**

**WTO ’21 -** World Trade Organization, “WTO in Brief,” (2021). <https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\_e/whatis\_e/inbrief\_e/inbr\_e.pdf> TCHS-CS

In brief, the World Trade Organization (WTO) is the only international organization dealing with the global rules of trade. Its main function is to ensure that trade flows as smoothly, predictably and freely as possible.¶ Global trade rules¶ Global rules of trade provide assurance and stability. Consumers and producers know they can enjoy secure supplies and greater choice of the finished products, components, raw materials and services they use. Producers and exporters know foreign markets will remain open to them.¶ This leads to a more prosperous, peaceful and accountable economic world. Decisions in the WTO are typically taken by consensus among all members and they are ratified by members’ parliaments. Trade frictions are channelled into the WTO’s dispute settlement process, where the focus is on interpreting agreements and commitments and how to ensure that members’ trade policies conform with them. That way, the risk of disputes spilling over into political or military conflict is reduced.¶ By lowering trade barriers through negotiations among member governments, the WTO’s system also breaks down other barriers between peoples and trading economies.¶ At the heart of the system – known as the multilateral trading system – are the WTO’s agreements, negotiated and signed by a large majority of the world’s trading economies, and ratified in their parliaments.¶ These agreements are the legal foundations for global trade. Essentially, they are contracts, guaranteeing WTO members important trade rights. They also bind governments to keep their trade policies transparent and predictable which is to everybody’s benefit.¶ The agreements provide a stable and transparent framework to help producers of goods and services, exporters and importers conduct their business.¶ The goal is to improve the welfare of the peoples of the WTO’s members.

**Trade causes food insecurity, environmental destruction, racist and sexist violence, poverty, exploitation, and destroys investment in public wellbeing. Business hoards the gains.**

**Paul & Gebrial ’21 -** The Ecologist, August 25, 2021, Harpreet Kaur Paul and Dalia Gebrial are the curators and editors of Perspectives on a Global Green New Deal, where this article first appeared.<https://theecologist.org/2021/aug/25/agribusiness-devastates-our-environment>

The global food system is driving environmental injustice and increasing greenhouse gas emissions. The ability of communities around the world to live autonomously and harmoniously on the land to which they are tied is routinely and violently intercepted by multinational corporations in the name of conservation and food and energy provision. Yet, the same **communities in the Global South whose land is grabbed under** international **trade** and investment **agreements** for these purposes**, are the same communities systematically denied from the harvests exported from places that have been taken**. This series of articles has been published in partnership with Dalia Gebrial and Harpreet Kaur Paul and the Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung in London. It first appeared in a collection titled Perspectives on a Global Green New Deal. Toll The global food system is driving environmental injustice through extreme water use, the pollution of ecosystems by pesticides and agricultural run-off and producing roughly a quarter of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions. **In the last two decades,** it is estimated that **26.7 million hectares of land has been acquired by foreign investors** for use in the agriculture business. Yet, the global, multinational corporation driven agricultural industry - which we refer to as agribusiness - implicated in these acquisitions, has only become more inefficient, unequal, polluting and reliant on displacement.Much of this is rooted in the unevenness of land ownership, where **industrial commodity crop farms have taken land away from those who use it for** direct, **local food production,** and who often have spiritual, cultural and ancestral connections to the land. Many of these commodity crop farms use vast swathes of land for the production of just one crop, like palm oil or sugar, which places a huge toll on the health of the soil and its ability to support diverse plant growth later. Deprivations According to GRAIN, small farms make up 90 percent of all farms - and yet these small farmers have just 25 percent of the world’s farmland to work on.3 Indeed, small farmers - mainly women - feed most of the world on less than a quarter of all agricultural land. The large **agribusinesses** that own the majority of the land and **control trade in grain, biotech and industrial food production force out local food producers and impoverished people,** and drive environmental degradation **with** the highly **polluting activities and intensive water use** at the core of their practice. Workers in the industry also continue to rank among the world’s most insecure workforces. The International Labour Organization (ILO) estimates that at least **170,000 workers in the agricultural sector are killed each year** - whether **through lack of protections, higher risk of poverty or exposure to toxic pesticides. Indigenous peoples** are custodians of 80 percent of the world’s remaining biodiversity, but **are facing severe food insecurity** Meanwhile, indigenous peoples are custodians of 80 percent of the world’s remaining biodiversity, but are facing severe food insecurity, extreme poverty and other human rights deprivations. Trade **Agribusiness** fundamentally **fails** to adequately fulfil **the food needs of the worlds’** population - **one in three people face** some form of **malnourishment,**

and one in nine face hunger issues. The ‘supermarketisation’ of food systems leads to an increase in reliance on processed, rather than fresh, food - con- tributing to this rise in malnutrition and obesity. Children remain the most vulnerable to malnutrition - according to the World Health Organization, malnutrition is the underlying contributing factor in approximately 45 percent of deaths of children under five. Today’s ***food systems are dominated by trade​​​​​​ agreements and economic policies that prioritise profits over the right to food.*** ***Power is concentrated in the hands of a few corporate actors that benefit from free trade rules and export-oriented agricultural policies.*** Such regimes privilege large-scale agribusinesses to the detriment of others, creating instability in the global food system. Pollution Yet, the food produced in this way represents a small part of global production - the UN estimates that 70-80 percent of the food consumed in most of the Global South is produced by smallholder farms. The 20-30 percent of food produced by large agri-businesses is having huge, destructive impacts across the system. Big commodity traders like Bunge Ltd, Cargill, Luis Dreyfus and Archer Daniels Midland, are the agricultural equivalents of fossil fuel companies like Shell and BP. They reap the rewards of a broken system and are subsidised by state handouts, while leaving the basic needs of millions unfulfilled and de- stroying the natural world. **Trade agreements encourage the planting of cash crops and the industrial meat industry, thereby incentivising deforestation, the redirection of water away from local communities and the pollution of ecosystems.** Grazing Indeed, the destruction of forests in order to grow animal feed is one of the biggest threats to biodiversity, which is vital to sustainable agriculture, resilient and sustainable food production, and carbon sequestration. This process also results in the marginalisation of women from agricultural decision-making, whose subsistence-based knowledge and practices are derided and made impossible. Women face a lack of voice in shaping work agendas, and increasingly depend on men for cash and access to the market to purchase the food they previously grew. This contributes to a growing dissonance between women’s roles as agriculturalists and the social recognition accorded to them, and has particularly troubling implications for household food security, since the main responsibility for this lies in women’s hands. It also prioritises business-led ways of knowing and doing over more sustainable methods, like traditional rotational systems, permanent pasture and conservation grazing. System Industrial agricultural practices also threaten food stability by reducing our resilience to intensifying ecological impacts - such as desertification - in the future. A 2015 report from the UN Food and Agriculture Organization found that, globally, 25 to 40 billion tonnes of topsoil are lost annually to erosion, thanks mainly to ploughing and intensive cropping. The IPCC’s August 2019 Special Report on Climate Change and Land found that to become fit for purpose in an era of climate change, agriculture must move away from intensive and industrialised approaches, and towards food systems based on agroecology and less and better meat. **Countries on the frontline** of the most extreme impacts **have** done very little to cause the crisis and instead **been required - through trade** and investment **agreements - to open** their **markets to foreign investment in a carbon intensive, displacing and polluting way of growing food.** A vicious and ironic cycle, where global agribusiness is behind some of the biggest threats to food sustainability and accessibility, is therefore coded in the DNA of our global food system. Agro-chemicals The Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights warns that **this is leading towards a “climate apartheid** scenario **in which the wealthy pay to escape overheating, hunger and conflict, while the rest of the world is left to suffer**”. In response to this crisis, the international peasant movement La Vía Cam- pesina developed the concept of ‘food sovereignty’ in the 1990s. Introduced at the World Food Summit in 1996, food sovereignty was framed as an explicit critique of the neoliberal global food system13, representing a radical break with the dominant agrarian system. The 2007 Nyeleni Declaration defines food sovereignty as “the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems.” Food sovereignty prioritises factors such as local production, direct commercialisation, the use of agroecological methods, opposition to genetically modified crops and agro-chemicals, and rights to land, water, seeds and biodiversity. Trade creates gender and social inequality Donatella Alessandrini, 8-23, 21, Trade and the Green New Deal,<https://theecologist.org/2021/aug/23/trade-and-green-new-deal>, Donatella Alessandrini is a Professor Of Law at University Of Kent in Canterbury, UK. Giant chickens opposing a US trade deal visit the North Somerset constituency surgery of Liam International **trade** and investment **treaties are built on the** problematic **assumption that countries trade** with one another **because** they have different **competitive advantages** which can be exchanged to everyone’s mutual benefit. The problem with this assumption is that it fails to articulate how various advantages came about.The ways in which **states and corporations** come to **gain** specific **competitive advantages** are **through processes permeated** by social inequalities, including **gender and racial inequalities.** This series of articles has been published in partnership with Dalia Gebrial and Harpreet Kaur Paul and the Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung in London. It first appeared in a collection titled Perspectives on a Global Green New Deal.Inequalities **Underpinning gender inequalities in the labour market,** as feminist economists have argued**, is the pursuit of competitive advantage by avoiding paying towards the full costs of the reproduction of the labour force and of our planet.** For example **firms** may **establish themselves in jurisdictions where they pay less tax, which has a negative impact on the revenue available to provide** local public **education, health services and,** crucially**, environmental standards.** Multinational corporations also create complex supply webs to push any costs of contributing in these ways to local contractors who then squeeze the labour force and exploit or neglect the environment in order to extract profits on small operating revenues, **while big brands take the bulk of the trade benefit.** CompetitivenessThe way in which workers and the environment are treated and regulated is constitutive of what we call competitive advantage, rather than being its consequence or ‘externality’.The pressure on firms and states to abide by the ‘commercial provisions’ of trade and investment treaties (to say nothing of the private contracts signed between firms) means that, unless the contribution workers and the environment make to production and trade is properly acknowledged, treated and remunerated, its invisibilization and/or devaluation will continue to provide a source of competitiveness in the global economy.

**Turns case - Free trade leads to massive spread of infectious disease**

**ASU 15** (Arizona State University, cites a new study by Charles Perrings, an ASU professor of environmental economics, “Infectious disease spread is fueled by international trade” December 22 2015, <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/12/151222163415.htm>) TCHS-CS

International trade and travel has literally opened up new vistas for humans, ranging from travel to exotic places to enjoying the products and services of those distant lands. But along with international trade and travel comes the risk of **spreading infectious diseases**, a growing problem in today's global economy, says an Arizona State University researcher. "The recent Ebola outbreak made us realize that **we are all just a plane ride away from exposure to emerging infectious diseases**," says Charles Perrings, an ASU professor of environmental economics. Perrings recently published the paper, "Options for Managing the Infectious Animal and Plant Disease Risks of International Trade," in the early online version of the journal Food Security. The paper reported project results to an international conference "Global Plant Health Risks and Consequences: Linking Science, Economics and Policy," hosted by the British Food and Environment Research Agency, and supported by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's Cooperative Research Programme on Biological Resource Management for Sustainable Agricultural Systems. Perrings is the principle investigator of a project funded by the National Science Foundation-National Institutes of Health-U.S. Department of Agriculture Ecology and Evolution of Infectious Diseases program in collaboration with the UK's Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council. In the paper, Perrings describes the growth of international trade since the 1950s and the increasingly tight coupling of developed and developing economies. The paper considers how the global community currently deals with trade-related infectious disease risks of animals and plants, and asks how the system could be made more effective. An example of the impact of an infectious disease came in 2001 in the UK when an outbreak of hoof and mouth disease cost some $10 billion and more than 2 million sheep and cattle had to be destroyed, Perrings said. More recently, African swine fever--a much more serious disease of pigs--has been spread in the Caucasus region through trade in pork, pork product or through waste in trade vehicles. "The more trade grows as a proportion of global production, the more likely it is that diseases will be spread through trade, and the higher the economic cost of resulting trade bans," Perrings said. "What is at risk is the food we eat, the fibers we wear and build with, and the fuels we burn." "In addition many infectious diseases that affect animals also affect people," he added. "Zoonoses like SARS, MERS, HIV AIDS, or highly pathogenic avian influenza, all originated in wild animals and were then spread person to person through trade and travel." Perrings said current instruments to control infectious diseases are far from adequate, as the recent report of the Harvard-London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine Independent Panel on the Global Response to Ebola, published in the Lancet, makes clear. "There are two problems to address," he said. "One is that disease spread is an unintended (external) effect of trade.