## 1

**The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing. Prefer:**

**1] Theory first –**

**A] Ground – both debaters have ground underneath util because every action has a consequence that can be weighed fairly using different metrics under the framing – other frameworks flow exclusively to one side.**

**B] Topic lit – most articles are written through a utilitarian lens because they are crafted for policymakers and the general public who believes consequences are important – key to fairness because topic lit is how we determine in-round engagement.**

**2] Use epistemic modesty to evaluate competing frameworks: that means multiply the probability the framework is true by the magnitude of the impact under a framework. Prefer:**

**A] Maximizes the probability of achieving net most moral value—beating a framework acts as mitigation to their impacts which means its substantively true.**

**B] Clash – disincentives debaters from going all in for framework which means we get the ideal balance between topic ed and phil ed—it’s important to talk about contention-level offense.**

**3] Actor specificity:**

**A] Aggregation – governments only have access to averages and aggregates which are the basis of justification for their policies**

**B] No intent-foresight distinction – If we foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen**

**C] Util is intrinsic to us we can’t avoid that maximizing well being is the most moral action**

**Nagel 86:** Thomas Nagel, The View From Nowhere, HUP, 1986: 156-168.

I shall defend the unsurprising claim that sensory pleasure is good and pain bad, no matter whose they are. The point of the exercise is to see how the pressures of objectification operate in a simple case. Physical pleasure and pain do not usually depend on activities or desires which themselves raise questions of justification and value. They are just sensory experiences in relation to which we are fairly passive, but toward which we feel involuntary desire or aversion. Almost Everyone takes the avoidance of his own pain and the promotion of his own pleasure as subjective reasons for action in a fairly simple way; they are not back up by any further reasons.

## 2

#### Intellectual property rights cannot be discriminated on the basis of field, or place of invention

WTO <https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips_04c_e.htm>, Article 27.1, Section 5 on patents, World trade Organization, WTO, Part II — Standards concerning the availability, scope and use of Intellectual Property Rights

Subject to the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3, patents shall be available for any inventions, whether products or processes, in all fields of technology, provided that they are new, involve an inventive step and are capable of industrial application. [(5)](https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips_04c_e.htm#fnt-5) Subject to paragraph 4 of Article 65, paragraph 8 of Article 70 and paragraph 3 of this Article, patents shall be available and patent rights enjoyable without discrimination as to the place of invention, the field of technology and whether products are imported or locally produced.

#### The WTO’s appellate body no longer exists to mediate disputes, without immediate buy in by states, and no mechanism to make disobedient states obey, the system collapses

Horton, 08/3, Lessons from Trump’s assault on the World Trade Organization, https://www.chathamhouse.org/2021/08/lessons-trumps-assault-world-trade-organization, Chatham House – International Affairs Think Tank, Communications Manager; Project Lead, Common Futures Conversations

The WTO is unique amongst international institutions because it has a powerful enforcement mechanism – the dispute settlement system. However, the fundamental vulnerability is that if powerful states like the US and others won’t participate in the system and be bound by its rules, they quickly risk becoming irrelevant. And that’s the situation we’re in right now with the appellate body crisis, where, without a functioning mechanism to ensure that WTO rules are enforced, the entire system of global trade rules risk collapsing. Ironically, the United States has been the leader of the liberal trading order for the past 70 years, but since Trump, it has become its leading saboteur.

#### A major country operating outside WTO consensus wrecks global trade norms

Bacchus 20 [James Bacchus, member of the Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies, the Distinguished University Professor of Global Affairs and director of the Center for Global Economic and Environmental Opportunity at the University of Central Florida, 12-16-2020, "An Unnecessary Proposal: A WTO Waiver of Intellectual Property Rights for COVID-19 Vaccines," Cato Institute, [https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines]/Kankee](https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines%5d/Kankee)

In a sign of their increasing frustration with global efforts to ensure that all people everywhere will have access to COVID-19 vaccines, several developing countries have asked other members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) to join them in a sweeping waiver of the intellectual property (IP) rights relating to those vaccines. Their waiver request raises anew the recurring debate within the WTO over the right balance between the protection of IP rights and access in poorer countries to urgently needed medicines. But the last thing the WTO needs is another debate over perceived trade obstacles to public health. Unless WTO members reach a consensus, the multilateral trading system may be further complicated by a delay like that in resolving the two‐​decades‐​old dispute between developed and developing countries over the compulsory licensing and generic distribution of HIV/AIDS drugs. A new and contentious “North‐​South” political struggle definitely would not be in the interest of the developed countries, the developing countries, the pharmaceutical companies, or the WTO. Certainly it would not be in the interest of the victims and potential victims of COVID-19. Background In early October 2020, India and South Africa asked the members of the WTO to waive protections in WTO rules for patents, copyrights, industrial designs, and undisclosed information (trade secrets) in relation to the “prevention, containment or treatment of COVID-19 … until widespread vaccination is in place globally, and the majority of the world’s population has developed immunity.”1 India and South Africa want to give all WTO members freedom to refuse to grant or enforce patents and other IP rights relating to COVID-19 vaccines, drugs, diagnostics, and other technologies for the duration of the pandemic. In requesting the waiver, India and South Africa have argued that “an effective response to the COVID-19 pandemic requires rapid access to affordable medical products including diagnostic kits, medical masks, other personal protective equipment and ventilators, as well as vaccines and medicines for the prevention and treatment of patients in dire need.” They have said that “as new diagnostics, therapeutics and vaccines for COVID-19 are developed, there are significant concerns, how these will be made available promptly, in sufficient quantities and at affordable prices to meet global demand.”2 Later in October, the members of the WTO failed to muster the required consensus to move forward with the proposed waiver. The European Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, and other developed countries opposed the waiver request.3 One WTO delegate, from the United Kingdom, described it as “an extreme measure to address an unproven problem.”4 A spokesperson for the European Union explained, “There is no evidence that intellectual property rights are a genuine barrier for accessibility of COVID‐​19‐​related medicines and technologies.”5 In the absence of a consensus, WTO members have decided to postpone further discussion of the proposed waiver until early 2021. Balancing IP Rights and Access to Medicines Not New to WTO This waiver controversy comes nearly two decades after the end of the long battle in the multilateral trading system over access to HIV/AIDS drugs. At the height of the HIV/AIDS crisis at the turn of the century, numerous countries, including especially those from sub‐​Saharan Africa, could not afford the high‐​priced HIV/AIDS drugs patented by pharmaceutical companies in developed countries. Having spent billions of dollars on developing the drugs, the patent holders resisted lowering their prices. The credibility of the companies, the countries that supported them, and the WTO itself were all damaged by an extended controversy over whether patent rights should take precedence over providing affordable medicines for people afflicted by a lethal disease. Article 8 of the WTO Agreement on the Trade‐​Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (the TRIPS Agreement) provides that WTO members “may, in formulating or amending their laws and regulations, adopt measures necessary to protect public health … provided that such measures are consistent with the provisions of this Agreement.” In similar vein, Article 7 of the TRIPS Agreement provides that the “protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights” shall be “in a manner conducive to social and economic welfare.”6 It can be maintained that these two WTO IP rules are significantly capacious to include any reasonable health measures that a WTO member may take during a health emergency, such as a pandemic. Yet there was doubt among the members during the HIV/AIDS crisis about the precise reach of these provisions. As Jennifer Hillman of the Council on Foreign Relations observed, ordinarily the “inherent tension between the protection of intellectual property and the need to make and distribute affordable medicines” is “resolved through licensing, which allows a patent holder to permit others to make or trade the protected product—usually at a price and with some supervision from the patent holder to ensure control.”7 But, in public health emergencies, it may be impossible to obtain a license. In such cases, “compulsory licenses” can be issued to local manufacturers, authorizing them to make patented products or use patented processes even though they do not have the permission of the patent holders.8

#### Without all states buy in, we risk WW3 but with nukes

Hopewell and Horton 08-03 [Kristen Hopewell Associate Professor and Canada Research Chair in Global Policy at the University of British Columbia, and Ben Horton, Communications Manager; Project Lead, Common Futures Conversations, 08-03-2021, "Lessons from Trump’s assault on the World Trade Organization," Chatham House – International Affairs Think Tank, https://www.chathamhouse.org/2021/08/lessons-trumps-assault-world-trade-organization]/Kankee

What has this episode revealed about the strength of multilateral institutions such as the WTO, in the face of spoiling tactics from major powers? The WTO is unique amongst international institutions because it has a powerful enforcement mechanism – the dispute settlement system. However, the fundamental vulnerability is that if powerful states like the US and others won’t participate in the system and be bound by its rules, they quickly risk becoming irrelevant. And that’s the situation we’re in right now with the appellate body crisis, where, without a functioning mechanism to ensure that WTO rules are enforced, the entire system of global trade rules risk collapsing. Ironically, the United States has been the leader of the liberal trading order for the past 70 years, but since Trump, it has become its leading saboteur. What are the implications of a permanent collapse of the international trading system? The very real danger from such a breakdown is a return to what we saw in the 1930s. In response to the outbreak of the Great Depression, you had countries imposing trade barriers, blocking imports from other state, and a general escalation of tit-for-tat protectionism. This response wound up not only exacerbating the effects of the depression itself but has also been credited by some as paving the way for the outbreak of the second world war. The reason why institutions like the WTO were created in the first place was to prevent a recurrence of the 1930s protectionist trade spiral. The danger now – if those rules become meaningless and unenforceable – is the institutional foundations of postwar economic prosperity could unravel, throwing us back into economic chaos and potentially political disorder. What does the WTO’s future look like under new director-general Dr Okonjo-Iweala?