### Framing

#### The standard is maximizing well-being

#### The meta-ethic is consequentialism – joy and suffering give ethics a teleological basis.

Ariansen 98 [Per, professor of philosophy at University of Oslo. 02/01/1998. “Anthropocentrism with a human face.” <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800997001390>] JCH-PF

Suspending for a while the idea of morality as a game, one could approach the question of the nature of ethics from another angle. One could try to seek out a set of necessary and sufficient conditions for ethics to be operative. What traits of ethics cannot be lacking without ethics losing its meaning? Will ethics be meaningful in a world where no suffering (to focus on the duty to alleviate suffering rather that promote happiness) is known to anyone? Technically it would be possible to tell a lie or break a promise in such a society, but the difference between lying and telling the truth or breaking and keeping promises would have no moral significance, since any outcome of any event is just as good (rather, as indifferent) as any other outcome of the event. In such a world any mention of responsibilities and duties would be meaningless. Ethics clearly needs to relate to joy and suffering. This axiological orientation is necessary to give meaning to the ethical project, to mark it out as an ethical project in contrast to other projects of rationalization.

#### Actor specificity and aggregation – every policy benefits some and harms others, meaning side constraints freeze action

#### Reject calc indicts – It’s empirically denied—both individuals and policymakers carry out effective cost-benefit analysis meaning even if decisions aren’t perfect it’s better than not acting at all

#### Only consequentialism explains the value in necessary enablers.

Sinnott-Armstrong ’92 Walter, Dartmouth College Philosophical Perspectives, 6, Ethics, AN ARGUMENT FOR CONSEQUENTIALISM

fulfillment of a promise and not because of its consequences."2 Such deontologists claim in effect that if I promise to mow the grass, there is a moral reason for me to mow the grass and this moral reason is constituted by the fact that mowing the grass fulfills my promise. This reason exists regardless of the consequences of mowing the grass even though it might be overridden by certain bad consequences. However if this is why I have a moral reason to mow the grass then even if I cannot mow the grass without starting my mower and starting the mower would enable me to mow the grass it still would not follow that l have any moral reason to start my mower since I did not promise to start my mower and starting my mower does not fulfill my promise. Thus a moral theory cannot explain moral substitutability ii it claims that properties like this provide moral reasons. Of course this argument is too simple to be conclusive by itself since deontologists will have many responses. The question is whether any response is adequate. I will argue that no response can meet the basic challenge. A deontologist might respond that his moral theory includes not only the principle that there is a moral reason to keep one's promises but also another principle that there is a moral reason to do whatever is a necessary enabler for what there is a moral reason to do. This other principle just is the principle of moral substitutability. So of course. I agree that it is true. However, the question is why it is true. This new principle is very different from the substantive principles in a deontological theory. So it cries out for an explanation. ii a deontologist simply adds this new principle to the substantive principles in his theory. he has done nothing to explain why the new principle is true. It would be ad hoc to tack it on solely in order to yield moral reasons like the moral reason to start the mower. in order to explain or justify moral substitutability. A deontologist needs to show how this principle coheres in some deeper way with the substantive principles of the theory. That is what deontologists cannot do. A second response is that l misdescribed the property that provides the moral reason. Deontologists might admit that the reason to mow the lawn is not that this fulfills a promise. but they can claim instead that the moral reason to mow the lawn is that this is a necessary enabler for keeping a promise. They can then claim that there is a moral reason to start the mower. because starting the mower is also a necessary enabler for keeping my promise. Again. I agree that these reasons exist. But the question is why. This deontologist needs to explain why the moral reason has to be that the act is a necessary enabler for fulfilling a promise instead of just that the act does fulfill a promise. Ii there is no moral reason to keep a promise. it is hard to understand why there is any moral reason to do what is a necessary enabler for keeping a promise. Furthermore, deontologists claim that the crucial act is not about consequences but directly about promises. My moral reason is supposed to arise from what I said before my act and not from consequences alter my act. However, what I said was “I promise to mow the grass'. I did not say. ‘l promise to do what is a necessary enabler for mowing the grass.’ Thus I did not promise to do what is a necessary enabler for keeping the promise. What I promised was only to keep the promise. Because of this deontologists who base moral reasons directly on promises cannot explain why there is not only a moral reason to do what I promised to do (mow the grass) but also a moral reason to do what i did not promise to do (start the mower). Deontologists might try to defend the claim that moral reasons are based on promises by claiming that promise keeping is intrinsically good and there is a moral reason to do what is a necessary enabler of what is intrinsically good. However, this response runs into two problems. First, on this theory, the reason to keep a promise is a reason to do what is itself intrinsically good, but the reason to start the mower is not a reason to do what is intrinsically good. Since these reasons are so different, they are derived in different ways. This creates an incoherence or lack of unity, which is avoided in other theories. Second, this response conflicts with a basic theme in deontological theories. If my promise keeping is intrinsically good, your promise keeping is just as intrinsically good. But then, if what gives me a moral reason to keep my promise is that I have a moral reason to do whatever is intrinsically good, I have just as much moral reason to do what is a necessary enabler for you to keep your promise. And, if my breaking my promise is a necessary enabler for two other people to keep their promises, then my moral reason to break my promise is stronger than my moral reason to keep it (other things being equal). This undermines the basic deontological claim that my reasons derive in a special way from my promises.13 So this response explains moral sub- stitutability at the expense of giving up deontology.

#### Util is a lexical pre-req to any other framework, extinction must come first before anything else - precludes the possibility of any kind of moral value

Bernstein 02 (Richard J., Vera List Prof. Phil. – New School for Social Research, “Radical Evil: A Philosophical Interrogation”, p. 188-192)

There is a basic value inherent inorganic being, a basic affirmation, "The Yes' of Life" (IR 81). 15 "The self-affirmation of being becomes emphatic in the opposition of life to death. Life is the explicit confrontation of being with not-being. . . . The 'yes' of all striving is here sharpened by the active `no' to not-being" (IR 81-2). Furthermore — and this is the crucial point for Jonas — this affirmation of life that is in all organic being has a binding obligatory force upon human beings. This blindly self-enacting "yes" gains obligating force in the seeing freedom of man, who as the supreme outcome of nature's purposive labor is no longer its automatic executor but, with the power obtained from knowledge, can become its destroyer as well. He must adopt the "yes" into his will and impose the "no" to not-being on his power. But precisely this transition from willing to obligation is the critical point of moral theory at which attempts at laying a foundation for it come so easily to grief. Why does now, in man, that become a duty which hitherto "being" itself took care of through all individual willings? (IR 82). We discover here the transition from is to "ought" — from the self-affirmation of life to the binding obligation of human beings to preserve life not only for the present but also for the future. But why do we need a new ethics? The subtitle of The Imperative of Responsibility — In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age — indicates why we need a new ethics. Modern technology has transformed the nature and consequences of human action so radically that the underlying premises of traditional ethics are no longer valid. For the first time in history human beings possess the knowledge and the power to destroy life on this planet, including human life. Not only is there the new possibility of total nuclear disaster; there are the even more invidious and threatening possibilities that result from the unconstrained use of technologies that can destroy the environment required for life. The major transformation brought about by modern technology is that the consequences of our actions frequently exceed by far anything we can envision. Jonas was one of the first philosophers to warn us about the unprecedented ethical and political problems that arise with the rapid development of biotechnology. He claimed that this was happening at a time when there was an "ethical vacuum," when there did not seem to be any effective ethical principles to limit ot guide our ethical decisions. In the name of scientific and technological "progress," there is a relentless pressure to adopt a stance where virtually anything is permissible, includ-ing transforming the genetic structure of human beings, as long as it is "freely chosen." We need, Jonas argued, a new categorical imperative that might be formulated as follows: "Act so that the effects of your action are compatible with the permanence of genuine human life"; or expressed negatively: "Act so that the effects of your action are not destructive of the future possibility of such a life"; or simply: "Do not compromise the conditions for an indefinite continuation of humanity on earth"; or again turned positive: "In your present choices, include the future wholeness of Man among the objects of your will."continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size).

### DA:

#### 1] Long discussion times and inability to produce COVID vax at a mass scale ends aff solvency. Secondly, the aff harms future investment into vax needed for new strains, also links well into the political capital DA

Maruyama et al 21 Authored by Warren H. Maruyama, Kelly Ann Shaw, Nitya Anand, Celine J. Crowson, Alice Valder Curran, Ajay Kuntamukkala, Meredith Manning, Jonathan T. Stoel, Joy E. Sturm <https://www.engage.hoganlovells.com/knowledgeservices/viewContent.action?key=Ec8teaJ9VapwhhbviT90F8xgHJMKLFEppVpbbVX%2B3OXcP3PYxlq7sZUjdbSm5FIetvAtgf1eVU8%3D&nav=FRbANEucS95NMLRN47z%2BeeOgEFCt8EGQ0qFfoEM4UR4%3D&emailtofriendview=true&freeviewlink=true>

While the proposed request for the WTO waiver stirs up political theater, it is unlikely to lead to meaningful improvements in developing country access to vaccines in the near-term. Months of difficult negotiation regarding the scope and the duration of the waiver are likely before a WTO consensus can be achieved.

More important, patents and other forms of intellectual property are not the main (or even a significant) barrier to improved developing country access at this time. Leading U.S. and EU vaccine developers have already licensed their technologies to Indian, Chinese, Russian, and South African vaccine manufacturers. Instead, the problem has been that the unprecedented global demand for COVID-19 vaccines has far outrun limited global production capacity. Even with access to IP, ramping up new vaccine production would require construction and qualification of new facilities to manufacture vaccines, a difficult, specialized, and exacting process, given the high stakes and the potentially life-threatening costs of failures. It also requires access to critical inputs, many of which are in short supply because of the unprecedented demand. Making advanced mRNA vaccines requires mastering new forms of vaccine production, given that it represents a new technology. And vaccine production requires critical know-how, raising questions about whether a WTO waiver will involve forced technology transfers. Finally, to date, one of the biggest challenge to developing country access has been that much of the worldwide supply of COVID-19 vaccines was bought up by the U.S., EU, and other wealthy economies, who have limited exports until their own populations are fully vaccinated.

Despite its political appeal, a waiver involves risks of inadvertent consequences, since it would discourage future investments in new vaccine technologies and treatments at a time when they may be urgently needed to deal with new variations of the virus. It appears at odds with the Biden Administration’s “Build Back Better” initiatives to move production of key medical technologies back onshore, build more resilient U.S. supply chains, and support U.S. global leadership in biomedical innovation, since it would transfer leading U.S. technologies abroad to China, India, Russia, and South Africa, among others.

Conclusion

While the U.S. has bought into the idea of a waiver, a difficult and protracted WTO negotiation lies ahead over the waiver’s scope, product coverage, and duration. India, China, and South Africa have very capable trade negotiators and will be riding high after the U.S. reversal. While COVID-19 puts unprecedented pressures on the WTO to reach an agreement, achieving a consensus of the WTO’s 164 Members – which is necessary to effect the waiver – is likely to be a complicated and time-consuming effort.

#### 2] Waiving patents for COVID vaccines doesn’t increase production AND it makes the extended response to current & future pandemics worse

Kappos, David J, and Paul R Michel. “Waiving Covid-19 Vaccine Patents Won’t Get Shots in Arms Faster. It Slows down New Vaccines.” NBC News, NBC News, 25 May 2021, [www.nbcnews.com/think/opinion/waiving-covid-19-vaccine-patents-won-t-get-shots-arms-ncna1268099. Accessed 16 Sept. 2021](http://www.nbcnews.com/think/opinion/waiving-covid-19-vaccine-patents-won-t-get-shots-arms-ncna1268099.%20Accessed%2016%20Sept.%202021).

WTO director-general Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala [said on Friday](https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/vaccine-patent-waiver-will-not-be-enough-wto-chief-2021-05-20/) that a full waiver of companies' Covid-19 vaccine patents under the World Trade Organization's auspices — sought by many developing countries and supported by President Joe Biden to combat disproportionate access to the therapies — will not be enough to speed up the provision of vaccines to countries where it is lagging.

On that small point, at least, we agree: The nations that spearheaded the petition to waive the patent rights at the WTO, India and South Africa, have been unable to provide any evidence that the international system of respecting intellectual property rights under the law have impeded the development, production or distribution of Covid-19 vaccines and treatments.

And it is hard to imagine that any such evidence will be forthcoming, as intellectual property is facilitating — not inhibiting — the pharmaceutical industry's pandemic response.

Normally fierce rival companies have been able to cooperate on vaccine production precisely because inventors know their property rights are — and will remain — secure. For instance, Johnson & Johnson invited Merck to help manufacture its viral-vector vaccine, while Pfizer and BioNTech, which jointly developed their revolutionary mRNA vaccine, are similarly working with French drug giant Sanofi to boost its production.

And generics manufacturers are already working around the clock on a contract basis with innovator firms to produce vaccines. For instance, India's largest generics manufacturer, the Serum Institute, is producing billions of doses of the AstraZeneca vaccine for low-income countries, while South Africa's largest generics firm, Aspen Pharmacare, is producing hundreds of millions of doses of Johnson & Johnson's vaccine.

India and South Africa's petition to nullify intellectual property protections, were it to have been in effect, would have made those collaborations impossible.

Suspending intellectual property rights will not get shots in arms any faster at this point and would, in fact, undermine efforts to scale up vaccine production. As Okonjo-Iweala herself pointed out last week, though it will take time to negotiate a wholesale change to WTO treaties, the capacity to manufacture Covid-19 vaccines already exists in Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Thailand, Senegal and South Africa but is currently sitting idle despite existing frameworks giving manufacturers in those places the right to start.

The EU, in the meantime, has [offered a counterproposal](https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/eu-present-wto-plan-boost-vaccine-production-2021-05-19/) to waive or minimize export restrictions on vaccines and vaccine components, to pledge to supply vaccines to countries with shortages at cost and to allow more countries to take advantage of existing WTO rules that allow countries to license intellectual property without the consent of the patent holders, essentially allowing for an increasing production capacity without waiving the patent rights altogether. So while the appeal of an intellectual property waiver is tempting in the short-run, doing so imperils our ability to develop new medicines and combat future pandemics. The Biden administration, however, announced its support for such a petition earlier in May and progressive groups cheered, contending that the intellectual property suspension would hasten and make more equitable the global vaccine rollout by enabling more manufacturers to produce the vaccines developed by Western firms.

And, certainly, the rapid and equitable distribution of Covid-19 vaccines is absolutely critical to ending this pandemic. But sacrificing the innovation ecosystem in order to achieve this end would be myopic policy.

There are already very real challenges to inoculating the world, including a widespread lack of proper refrigeration (let alone the ultracold storage required for some vaccines), a shortage of trained professionals to administer them and conduct follow-up evaluations, and a lack of patient compliance with the two-dose regimen for the Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna jabs.

Plus, there have already been issues with fakes and a lack of trust in the government that have come into play. In Mexico and Poland, [authorities have identified](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.wsj.com/articles/pfizer-identifies-fake-covid-19-shots-abroad-as-criminals-exploit-vaccine-demand-11619006403__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!5im4XdWEGVpKy_ctvTTJNvidGqa0qNpMLCmOYVDuZgi0OzUdPpczT-h4tNU-_CdcL6-x$) counterfeit versions of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine. In Malawi, [the New York Times reported](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.nytimes.com/2021/04/14/world/europe/western-vaccines-africa-hesitancy.html__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!5im4XdWEGVpKy_ctvTTJNvidGqa0qNpMLCmOYVDuZgi0OzUdPpczT-h4tNU-_JTNQHUw$) that "people are asking doctors how to flush the AstraZeneca vaccine from their bodies." Suspending intellectual property rights will not remove any of these roadblocks and would likely exacerbate them. Without certain quality controls implemented by original patent holders, especially in places with existing levels of government or industrial corruption, we could see ineffective vaccines manufactured using substandard processes, and then administered without adequate refrigeration, professional handling or required counseling and follow up.

In this moment, leaders and policymakers in the developed world should focus their efforts on helping other nations overcome these challenges, rather than debating the finer points of intellectual property law at the WTO. The latter is a waste of precious time, especially since without intellectual property protections, there might never have been vaccines to debate — at least not yet.

Take Moderna's vaccine: A mere two days after Chinese authorities publicly disclosed Covid-19's genetic sequence in January 2020, Moderna had already [sequenced](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.modernatx.com/modernas-work-potential-vaccine-against-covid-19__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!5im4XdWEGVpKy_ctvTTJNvidGqa0qNpMLCmOYVDuZgi0OzUdPpczT-h4tNU-_JLzWrLk$) its vaccine candidate, mRNA-1273 — which ultimately proved 94.5 percent effective and became one of the first vaccines approved for emergency use in the United States and the European Union. (By way of comparison, the creation of viable vaccines for smallpox, chickenpox, typhoid fever and polio took decades.) Moderna's Covid-19 vaccine was the result of 10 years of work, which took [at least $2 billion](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.statnews.com/2020/11/10/the-story-of-mrna-how-a-once-dismissed-idea-became-a-leading-technology-in-the-covid-vaccine-race/__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!5im4XdWEGVpKy_ctvTTJNvidGqa0qNpMLCmOYVDuZgi0OzUdPpczT-h4tNU-_CQ_aUV5$) from investors. Investors were willing to support Moderna for so many years — and potentially lose billions in the process — because they knew both that its technology could revolutionize medicine and that the technology would be protected by intellectual property rules.

Investments in Moderna paid off — but [only 12 percent](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.phrma.org/-/media/Project/PhRMA/PhRMA-Org/PhRMA-Org/PDF/0-9/6--67416-Intellectual.pdf__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!5im4XdWEGVpKy_ctvTTJNvidGqa0qNpMLCmOYVDuZgi0OzUdPpczT-h4tNU-_N2nrSD8$) of investigational medicines entering clinical trials are ultimately approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Association. As the average cost of developing a new drug approaches [$3 billion](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.phrma.org/-/media/Project/PhRMA/PhRMA-Org/PhRMA-Org/PDF/0-9/6--67416-Intellectual.pdf__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!5im4XdWEGVpKy_ctvTTJNvidGqa0qNpMLCmOYVDuZgi0OzUdPpczT-h4tNU-_N2nrSD8$), it's clear that no firm would conduct research and development without the promise of intellectual property rights, which give companies exclusive ownership of their inventions and a chance to recoup the investments that made the drug possible.

Moderna's success should be a clear lesson for every policymaker: Swift global public health responses to the pandemics of tomorrow are predicated on incentivizing research and clinical development of new drug candidates and clinical pathways today. The explosion of biopharma research — and the number of novel drugs brought to market to combat Covid-19 — are directly linked to a strong system of intellectual property rights.

The WTO waiver on patent rights for Covid-19 vaccines — let alone requirements for broader technology transfers, which Okonjo-Iweala appeared to call for on Friday — could shatter this system. It is unrealistic to assume groundbreaking innovations will simply appear without solid and reliable protections for those who risk the time and money to develop them.

### DA:

#### The 1AC reduction in IP rights around medicine spills over to biotech, killing investment

Brand 21 Brand, Melissa. “TRIPS IP Waiver Could Establish Dangerous Precedent for Climate Change and Other Biotech Sectors.” Ipwatchdog, 26 May 2021, www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/26/trips-ip-waiver-establish-dangerous-precedent-climate-change-biotech-sectors/id=133964/. Melissa Brand is Assistant General Counsel and Director of Intellectual Property at the Biotechnology Innovation Organization (BIO), a major trade association with over 1,000 members in the biotechnology industry. In her role at BIO, Ms. Brand advocates on domestic and international intellectual property matters, with a particular emphasis on patent law and policy. Prior to joining BIO, Ms. Brand worked as a patent litigator at Latham & Watkins and Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati. Ms. Brand also served as a law clerk to the Honorable Kimberly A. Moore at the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. She graduated magna cum laude from the University of San Diego School of Law where she was a member of the Order of the Coif and served as a Comments Editor for the San Diego Law Review. She graduated cum laude with a degree in Biomedical Engineering from Vanderbilt University. //avery

While the discussions around waiving intellectual property (IP) rights set forth in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) are currently (and somewhat amorphously) limited to COVID-19 related drug and medical products, it is probably shortsighted to ignore the implications for other technologies critical to sustaining our environment and advancing a more healthful world. In fact, if we want to ensure continued investment in these technologies, we should be very concerned about the message conveyed by the international political tide: if you overcome a challenging scientific problem and your solution has the potential to save lives, be prepared to be subjected to intense political pressure and to potentially hand over your technology without compensation and regardless of the consequences. The biotech industry is making remarkable advances towards climate change solutions, and it is precisely for this reason that it can expect to be in the crosshairs of potential IP waiver discussions. President Biden is correct to refer to climate change as an existential crisis. Yet it does not take too much effort to connect the dots between President Biden’s focus on climate change and his Administration’s recent commitment to waive global IP rights for Covid vaccines (TRIPS IP Waiver). “This is a global health crisis, and the extraordinary circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures.” If an IP waiver is purportedly necessary to solve the COVID-19 global health crisis (and of course we dispute this notion), can we really feel confident that this or some future Administration will not apply the same logic to the climate crisis? And, without the confidence in the underlying IP for such solutions, what does this mean for U.S. innovation and economic growth? United States Trade Representative (USTR) Katherine Tai was subject to questioning along this very line during a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing. And while Ambassador Tai did not affirmatively state that an IP waiver would be in the future for climate change technology, she surely did not assuage the concerns of interested parties. International Pressure May Be Influencing Domestic IP Policy The United States has historically supported robust IP protection. This support is one reason the United States is the center of biotechnology innovation and leading the fight against COVID-19. However, a brief review of the domestic legislation arguably most relevant to this discussion shows just how far the international campaign against IP rights has eroded our normative position. The Clean Air Act, for example, contains a provision allowing for the mandatory licensing of patents covering certain devices for reducing air pollution. Importantly, however, the patent owner is accorded due process and the statute lays out a detailed process regulating the manner in which any such license can be issued, including findings of necessity and that no reasonable alternative method to accomplish the legislated goal exists. Also of critical importance is that the statute requires compensation to the patent holder. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Act contemplates mandatory licensing of patents covering inventions of primary importance in producing or utilizing atomic energy. This statute, too, requires due process, findings of importance to the statutory goals and compensation to the rights holder. A TRIPS IP waiver would operate outside of these types of frameworks. There would be no due process, no particularized findings, no compensation and no recourse. Indeed, the fact that the World Trade Organization (WTO) already has a process under the TRIPS agreement to address public health crises, including the compulsory licensing provisions, with necessary guardrails and compensation, makes quite clear that the waiver would operate as a free for all. Forced Tech Transfer Could Be on The Table When being questioned about the scope of a potential TRIPS IP waiver, Ambassador Tai invoked the proverb “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” While this answer suggests primarily that, in times of famine, the Administration would rather give away other people’s fishing rods than share its own plentiful supply of fish (here: actual COVID-19 vaccine stocks), it is apparent that in Ambassador Tai’s view waiving patent rights alone would not help lower- and middle-income countries produce their own vaccines. Rather, they would need to be taught how to make the vaccines and given the biotech industry’s manufacturing know-how, sensitive cell lines, and proprietary cell culture media in order to do so. In other words, Ambassador Tai acknowledged that the scope of the current TRIPS IP waiver discussions includes the concept of forced tech transfer. In the context of climate change, the idea would be that companies who develop successful methods for producing new seed technologies and sustainable biomass, reducing greenhouse gases in manufacturing and transportation, capturing and sequestering carbon in soil and products, and more, would be required to turn over their proprietary know-how [data] to global competitors. While it is unclear how this concept would work in practice and under the constitutions of certain countries, the suggestion alone could be devastating to voluntary international collaborations. Even if one could assume that the United States could not implement forced tech transfer on its own soil, what about the governments of our international development partners? It is not hard to understand that a U.S.-based company developing climate change technologies would be unenthusiastic about partnering with a company abroad knowing that the foreign country’s government is on track – with the assent of the U.S. government – to change its laws and seize proprietary materials and know-how that had been voluntarily transferred to the local company. Necessary Investment Could Diminish Developing climate change solutions is not an easy endeavor and bad policy positions threaten the likelihood that they will materialize. These products have long lead times from research and development to market introduction, owing not only to a high rate of failure but also rigorous regulatory oversight. Significant investment is required to sustain and drive these challenging and long-enduring endeavors. For example, synthetic biology companies critical to this area of innovation raised over $1 billion in investment in the second quarter of 2019 alone. If investors cannot be confident that IP will be in place to protect important climate change technologies after their long road from bench to market, it is unlikely they will continue to invest at the current and required levels. Next on the Chopping Block It is quite reasonable to be worried about the broad implications of a TRIPS IP waiver precedent. International campaigns to weaken IP rights seem to be taking hold in U.S. domestic policy. The TRIPS IP waiver discussions will not conclude in the near term and will not yield more shots in people’s arms. This is not even truly disputed, as our own [biden] administration acknowledges that the goal here is technology transfer abroad. Given the signaling that our Administration believes waiving IP rights is an appropriate measure to end global crises, it is proper to worry that facets of the biotech sector addressing climate change may be next on the chopping block.

#### Climate change destroys the world

Specktor 19 [Brandon writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years] 6-4-2019, "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html> Justin

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes**; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of** [**lethal heat conditions**](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly **one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert**. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations**, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in **nuclear war, are likely**. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

### DA (maybe):

#### Biden doesn’t want to spend capital on IP reform

Day 21 Biden Just Turned Down a Golden Opportunity to End Vaccine Apartheid BY MEAGAN DAY Meagan Day is a staff writer at Jacobin. She is the coauthor of Bigger than Bernie: How We Go from the Sanders Campaign to Democratic Socialism. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2021/07/biden-administration-covid-19-vaccine-apartheid-global-south-distribution-merkel> //avery

Biden just had a chance to take a stand and push for that reversal, but he neglected to spend his political capital pushing the chancellor to get on board with our best shot at ending the pandemic globally. He has taken the right public position on TRIPS, but so far it’s still an open question how serious he is about making it a reality.

#### Non-Climate issues drain Political Capital – reform doesn’t get passed

Dolsak and Prakash 20 Oct 16, 2020, 08:56pm EDT Will The Biden Administration Transform U.S. Climate Policy? Nives Dolsak and Aseem Prakash Nives Dolsak and Aseem PrakashContributor Sustainability We write on environmental issues, climate politics and NGOs. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2020/10/16/will-the-biden-administration-transform--us-climate-policy/?sh=249b01384d4c> //avery

Climate change was an important issue in the 2019 Democratic primaries. Although the Green New Dealers supported Bernie Sanders over Joe Biden, they consolidated behind Biden once he secured the nomination. In a public reconciliation effort, Biden asked Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez to co-chair his Climate Change Task Force with John Kerry. Although Biden and the Green New Dealers continue to differ on issues such as fracking, Democrats project the image of one big happy pro-climate family, united against a common foe. This has fed the expectation that the Biden Administration will transform U.S. climate policy. Trump turned the climate action switch off, but Biden will turn it back on. Biden’s pro-climate efforts will face many hurdles. Federal policymaking is complex, with multiple institutional veto points. Courts could become a stumbling block, as FDR discovered when pushing through New Deal legislations. Non-climate issues such as court-packing might suck up Biden’s political capital, as healthcare did for Obama. And with Trump’s defeat, internal rivalries within the Democratic party will resurface. Further, even if Trump loses elections, Trumpism is not going to disappear. As Tea Party mobilized Republicans against Obamacare, Trumpism could mobilize them against Biden’s climate agenda.

#### Any dent in political resources harms – Biden trying right now – k2 solve warming

Stone 21 Biden wants to cut U.S. climate pollution in half—here’s how Reducing emissions by at least 50 percent will require “everything to go right,” one expert says. BYMADELEINE STONE PUBLISHED APRIL 22, 2021 <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/article/biden-wants-to-cut-us-climate-pollution-in-half-heres-how> //avery

After a four-year hiatus, the United States is officially taking climate change seriously again. On Thursday, President Joe Biden pledged that by 2030, the nation will slash its carbon pollution 50 to 52 percent compared with 2005 levels. That goal, which represents America’s new “Nationally Determined Contribution” under the Paris Agreement, was announced during a two-day virtual summit Biden is hosting with leaders of the world’s largest economies, starting on Earth Day, to galvanize greater climate ambitions. It’s a bold leap forward from the Obama administration’s original Paris Agreement pledge to reduce emissions 26 to 28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025. But it falls squarely in line with what hundreds of scientists and public health experts, as well as heads of corporations, have called for in recent days.The announcement comes the same week that the European Union agreed to reduce its carbon emissions 55 percent by 2030 compared with the 1990 levels, and the U.K. announced historic emissions cuts of 78 percent by 2035, also compared with 1990.Many climate scientists say it’s imperative that the United States, which has put more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere over time than any other country, cut its climate-warming carbon pollution at least in half this decade. That’s necessary, they say, to limit global warming to 2.7 degrees Fahrenheit (1.5 degrees Celsius), the widely accepted threshold for preventing catastrophic damage from climate effects. Halving emissions this decade won’t be easy, but the goal is within reach, according to independent studies and a behind-the-scenes analysis the federal government has been conducting in the lead up to Biden’s announcement. To make it happen, the administration will have to marshall all of the resources at its disposal, enabling and accelerating decarbonization across every sector of the American economy.

### Case:

#### AT FWK:

#### Death > Structural violence, even 1% chance of mass death you vote neg, impacts outweigh on timeframe and scope

#### Morality fine

#### Turn covid stuff

#### Lack of ability not cuz trips

#### Also turn developing countries

#### No solvency