### Novice Negative Case 2.0

#### My value is life. Life is the most important priority to focus on, because Life is a precondition for all other values. To be equal, we must first be alive.

#### My criterion is our obligation to future generations. A life today is no more valuable than a life in the future. There will be even more people in the future, so sacrificing two lives in the future to save one life today is simply a short term bias.

#### Contention One: The Status Quo is working

#### 1. Vaccine companies are cooperating with the government to Ramp Up production of vaccines now, which will reach developing nations through programs like COVAX.

Ellyatt, Sept 22, 2021 - CNBC writer on European macro-economics [Holly Sept 22 2021 CNBC.com “U.S. to donate millions more Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine doses to poorer nations” https://www.cnbc.com/2021/09/22/us-to-donate-millions-more-pfizer-biontech-vaccine-doses-to-poorer-nations.html]

Pfizer and BioNTech will provide an additional 500 million doses of their Covid-19 vaccine to the U.S. government to be donated to lower-income countries. The move announced Wednesday represents an expansion of the companies’ agreement with the U.S. government to provide extra doses at a not-for-profit price for less-advantaged nations, It brings the total number of doses to be supplied for donation to these countries to 1 billion. In line with the initial agreement, the U.S. government will allocate doses of the Pfizer-BioNTech Covid vaccine to 92 low- and lower-middle-income countries and the 55 member states of the African Union, Pfizer said Wednesday. Deliveries of the initial 500 million doses began in August, and the 1 billion total under the expanded agreement are expected to be delivered by the end of next September, the company added. The first doses allocated through this program arrived in Rwanda in mid-August. Since then, more than 30 million doses have been shipped to 22 countries. Pfizer and BioNTech have an agreement in place to supply doses to the COVAX Facility, a mechanism established by Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations and World Health Organization that aims to provide poorer countries with early access to Covid-19 vaccines.

#### 2. The United Nations Children’s Fund negotiated a long term supply agreement with the Serum Institute of India that allows intellectual property from AstraZeneca and Novavax to distribute up to 1.1 billion affordable doses of vaccines for lower-middle income countries

Jerving 2021 - a Global Health Reporter based in Nairobi [Sara, 03 February 2021 Inside Development “COVAX releases country-by-country vaccine distribution figures” <https://www.devex.com/news/covax-releases-country-by-country-vaccine-distribution-figures-99058>]

Forecast figures include 240 million doses of the AstraZeneca-Oxford vaccine supplied through the Serum Institute of India, and 96 million doses of the same vaccine under an advance purchase agreement for the first half of the year. Delivery of these vaccines is expected to start in late February. The facility was initially supposed to receive 153 million doses of the AstraZeneca-Oxford vaccine through an advance purchase agreement, but delays in securing WHO emergency use listing for vaccine candidates mean that some shipments will only be available by the third quarter, said Seth Berkley, chief executive officer at Gavi.

#### Contention Two – Pharma Cooperation

#### Waiving patents undermines government cooperation with pharmaceutical companies – it is an Antagonistic policy that hurts supply chains and distribution.

Silverman, 2021 – Policy Fellow, Center for Global Development [Rachel February 8 “Would Exempting COVID-19 Vaccines from Intellectual Property Rights Improve Global Access and Equity?” Moderated By CGD President Masood Ahmed <https://www.cgdev.org/debate/would-exempting-covid-19-vaccines-intellectual-property-rights-improve-global-access>]

I agree that the current imperative is to scale existing vaccines as quickly as possible while maintaining strict safety and quality standards. But for the premise of this debate to be true, there would need to be additional manufacturers who could and would stand ready to manufacture additional vaccines if not thwarted by IP restrictions. I see no evidence that is currently the case—and, to the contrary, believe taking an antagonistic posture toward IP may actually slow or compromise production. Innovator companies are under enormous commercial and geopolitical pressure to scale as quickly as possible to meet enormous, immediate demand. Their profit-driven interest, in this case, is aligned with the global imperative to increase production. To do so, they are already cooperating widely with competitors and generic manufacturers, including via voluntary licenses, contracted production, and proactive technology transfer. Diluting that commercial incentive may reduce their interest in pursuing the voluntary horizontal collaborations that are already driving scale. It is also not clear that any additional generic manufacturers are “standing by” ready to produce. Under existing TRIPS flexibilities, countries can already issue compulsory licenses to produce vaccines without permission from the patent-holder. None have done so. Voluntary licensing and technology transfer from originator companies can help increase long-term manufacturing capacity, especially if paired with public investment; originators also have an interest in enforcing safety and quality control standards while doing so, which is especially important in the context of widespread vaccine hesitancy. Their cooperation is important for both speed and quality, and so far they seem willing to play ball.

#### Cooperation is essential to ramping up production – waiving patents would undermine investment necessary to increase production.

Jofre-Bonet, 2021 - Research Professor at the School of Public Health at Yale University, [Mireia “Would Waiving COVID-19 Vaccines Patents Save Lives?” with Mikel Berdud, Dimitrios Kourouklis, and Adrian Towse Tuesday, 18 May 2021 <https://www.ohe.org/news/would-waiving-covid-19-vaccines-patents-save-lives>]

The arguments against waiving COVID-19 vaccines IP revolve around two key points: First, lifting the patents will not yield more supply in 2021. R&D-based vaccine makers are making agreements to increase supply, with nearly 300 manufacturing and production agreements for COVID-19 vaccines made public, of which over two-thirds involved technology transfer. Capacity is expanding. Pre COVID-19 total global vaccine output was around 5 billion doses per annum. The capacity to make COVID-19 vaccines alone is expected to exceed 10 billion doses per annum by the end of 2021. The immediate constraints on increasing COVID-19 vaccines' production "are physical ones, supply chains and engineering ones, not legal." There are bottlenecks to the production of COVID-19 vaccines, whether mRNA, adenovirus, or protein subunit that are unrelated to IP. Specific raw materials and specialised equipment are scarce, and quality is key, with major problems at one manufacturer (Emergent BioSolutions) in the US. Finding scientists and engineers qualified to produce vaccines for COVID-19 is challenging, and even fewer of them are able to train others. Technology transfer takes time. Second, it will disincentivise future R&D and affect the rate of innovation in the short and the long run. There are 100 candidates in clinical development whose progress to authorisation could help tackle scarcity of supply and increase competition. However, the IP waiver may dissuade some of them from investing further. The longer-term dynamic negative impact on future innovation is related to compensation for risk. The threat of losing the patent for an innovative product when deemed essential to fight a health emergency creates an added risk for investors. Unfortunately, the threat of patent waiver is more likely to occur in areas of high global unmet need, e.g., Anti-Microbial Resistance or viruses which have higher chances of becoming global public health threats. There might be no way of substituting for private at-risk investment. Investing taxpayer money in high-risk, lengthy ventures may not be considered moral or timely. Prizes will only offer a viable alternative if they are large and pre-set, offering rewards of a size similar to patents.

#### Ramping up solves the COVID pandemic better than the Affirmative – it is much faster to Ramp Up.

Vaitilingam, 2021 – advisor at the Centre for Economic Performance at LSE [Romesh May 20th, 2021 “Vaccines for developing countries: the costs and benefits of waiving patents” <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/businessreview/2021/05/20/vaccines-for-developing-countries-the-costs-and-benefits-of-waiving-patents/>]

More nuances in the experts’ views come through in the short comments that they are able to include when they participate in the survey. Some focus on the need to overcome constraints on production and distribution of the vaccines to developing countries. For example, Barry Eichengreen at Berkeley says: “Companies currently producing the vaccines can ramp up production most quickly.” Kenneth Judd at Stanford adds: “These firms have experience in manufacturing their vaccines. Others do not.” Robert Shimer at Chicago notes: “Moderna and Pfizer have the expertise to produce those vaccines.” And Christopher Udry at Northwestern comments: “More quickly is the key. Scaling up is surely faster, even if more expensive.”

#### Contention Three – Medical Innovation

#### Subpoint One - waiving patents hurts pharmaceutical innovation – medical research is expensive, and investors need patents to ensure their costs are paid.

Vaitilingam, 2021 – advisor at the Centre for Economic Performance at LSE [Romesh May 20th, 2021 “Vaccines for developing countries: the costs and benefits of waiving patents” <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/businessreview/2021/05/20/vaccines-for-developing-countries-the-costs-and-benefits-of-waiving-patents/>]

Waiving patent protection may have significant negative effects.” Eric Maskin at Yale adds: “Patent holders have the incentive to supply vaccines if prevailing prices are paid, but not if patent rights are waived.” Many are concerned about the longer-term effects of patent waivers on innovation: Jan-Pieter Krahnen at Goethe University Frankfurt says: “Waiving patent laws this time will weaken patent laws at other times.” Oliver Hart at Yale adds: “I also think that waiving patent protection sets a very bad precedent.” And Steven Kaplan at Chicago states: “A big mistake and terrible precedent to waive patent protection.” These worries are widely shared, as indicated in an earlier IGM poll (see below). In the latest survey, David Autor at MIT says: “The US is setting a terrible precedent by voiding patents after successful cooperation with pharma during Warp Speed. It’s a repeated game.” Lubos Pastor at Chicago comments: “In addition, waiving patent protection could cause long-term damage to innovation by failing to protect intellectual property.” Robert Hall at Stanford takes it even further: “In any case, removing patent protection would be a taking in violation of the taking bar in the fifth amendment.”

#### The Next Pandemic is inevitable, and risks human extinction.

Diamandis, 2021 - Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology University of Toronto [Eleftherios 13 April 2021 Working Paper Review Version 1 – pre-peer review “The Mother of All Battles: Viruses vs. Humans. Can Humans Avoid Extinction in 50-100 Years?” https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202104.0397/v1]

The recent SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, which is causing COVID 19 disease, has taught us unexpected lessons about the dangers of human extinction through highly contagious and lethal diseases. As the COVID 19 pandemic is now being controlled by various isolation measures, therapeutics and vaccines, it became clear that our current lifestyle and societal functions may not be sustainable in the long term. We now have to start thinking and planning on how to face the next dangerous pandemic, not just overcoming the one that is upon us now. Is there any evidence that even worse pandemics could strike us in the near future and threaten the existence of the human race? The answer is unequivocally yes. It is not necessary to get infected by viruses of bats, pangolins and other exotic animals that live in remote forests in order to be in danger. Creditable scientific evidence indicates that the human gut microbiota harbor billions of viruses which are capable of affecting the function of vital human organs such as the immune system, lung, brain, liver, kidney, heart etc. It is possible that the development of pathogenic variants in the gut can lead to contagious viruses which can cause pandemics, leading to destruction of vital organs, causing death or various debilitating diseases such as blindness, respiratory, liver, heart and kidney failures. These diseases could result n the complete shutdown of our civilization and probably the extinction of human race. In this essay, I will first provide a few independent pieces of scientific facts and then combine this information to come up with some (but certainly not all) hypothetical scenarios that could cause human race misery, even extinction. I hope that these scary scenarios will trigger preventative measures that could reverse or delay the projected adverse outcomes.