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## 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative debater must defend reducing intellectual property protections for substances that treat diseases. To clarify, they may not defend substances that prevent diseases.

#### Violation: They defend \_\_\_\_\_\_.

#### Medicines treat diseases

Webster (Merriam Webster is America's leading and most-trusted provider of language information, accessed on 6-30-21, Merriam Webster, "Definition of MEDICINE,” https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/medicine)// ww pbj

Definition of medicine 1a: a substance or preparation used in treating disease cough medicine

#### Treatment is different than prevention

Pflanzer 20 (Lydia Ramsey Pflanzer is a healthcare editor for Business Insider. She joined Business Insider in 2015 after graduating from Northwestern University, 4-29-2020, accessed 6/30/21, "Scientists are racing to discover ways to treat and prevent coronavirus. Here's the difference between a treatment and a vaccine.," Business Insider, <https://www.businessinsider.com/whats-the-difference-between-a-vaccine-and-a-treatment-2020-4)//ww> pbj

Vaccines are used to prepare the body's immune system to fight off infections. They work by giving the body a small taste of what the virus is like so that way it can produce antibodies that fight off an intruding virus, ideally keeping people from falling ill. Some vaccines protect better than others, and they're typically administered across broad populations. There are vaccines for some infectious diseases, like the flu, smallpox, measles, and chickenpox. But others, like HIV and hepatitis C, don't have vaccines that protect against them. Vaccines that protect against two other deadly outbreaks, MERS and SARS, have yet to be approved after the outbreaks subsided. There are more than 70 potential coronavirus vaccines in the works, with a number in early human trials. Drugmakers are looking into ways to produce the billions of doses that might be needed to suppress the pandemic. Read more: There are more than 70 potential coronavirus vaccines in the works. Here are the top efforts to watch, including the 16 vaccines set to be tested in people this year. FILE - In this March 2020 photo provided by Gilead Sciences, a vial of the investigational drug remdesivir is visually inspected at a Gilead manufacturing site in the United States. Given through an IV, the medication is designed to interfere with an enzyme that reproduces viral genetic material. (Gilead Sciences via AP) FILE - In this March 2020 photo provided by Gilead Sciences, a vial of the investigational drug remdesivir is visually inspected at a Gilead manufacturing site in the United States. Given through an IV, the medication is designed to interfere with an enzyme that reproduces viral genetic material. (Gilead Sciences via AP) Associated Press Treatments, on the other hand, are meant to do just that: treat COVID-19, helping patients sickened by the virus survive and recover more quickly. Treatments for disease are there to lessen symptoms and ultimately improve the outcomes of a particular disease. Sometimes, medications can be used preventatively. For instance, patients with high cholesterol might be prescribed a medication called a statin to prevent heart attacks. Some potential coronavirus treatments are being studied to see if they can prevent people from contracting the virus in the first place. For COVID-19, researchers are testing everything from antimalarial medications to antivirals, to even common heartburn medications in hospitalized patients with the hopes that more patients will survive severe forms of the illness and potentially recover faster. Some are looking at ways to use patients' own bodies to fight the virus with antibody treatments.

#### Vaccines specifically are different from medicines

Immunize BC 20 (Immunize British Colombia is a collaborative project of the BC Ministry of Health, the BC Centre for Disease Control (an agency of the BC Provincial Health Services Authority), the regional health authorities (First Nations Health Authority, Fraser Health, Interior Health, Island Health, Northern Health and Vancouver Coastal Health), the BC Pharmacy Association and the Public Health Association of BC. Our mission is to improve the health of British Columbians by continuing to reduce the number of vaccine-preventable diseases, along with the illness, disability and death that they cause, What are vaccines?, Date last reviewed: Thursday, Mar 19, 2020, accessed on 6-30-21, <https://immunizebc.ca/what-are-vaccines)//ww> pbj

Vaccines are products that protect people against many diseases that can be very dangerous and even deadly. Different than most medicines that treat or cure diseases, vaccines prevent you from getting sick with the disease in the first place.

#### Standards:

#### [1] Limits – they explode the topic to include tons of substances that prevent disease rather than treat them like soap, medical supplies, or food and make it so there is *no* unified neg generics. The aff still gets the core of the topic lit: they get medicine, innovation, and global inequality. Explosion of aff ground makes neg prep burden impossible, either killing neg ground or forcing the neg to read generics that barely link, always letting aff win. Force the 1AR to read a definition card with a clear list of what’s included and excluded – otherwise, vote neg since they can’t put a clear limit on the topic. Our interp solves – it establishes a clear bright-line for that gives the neg a chance to predict and prepare for every aff ahead of time. At best, the aff’s extra-T still links to all our offense since they can get extra-T advantages to solve disads and defend whatever they want, magnifying limits.

#### [2] Precision – not defending the text of the resolution justifies the affirmative doing away with random words in the resolution which a] means they’re not within the topic which is a voter for jurisdiction since you can only vote affirmative on the resolution and this debate never should have happened, b] they’re unpredictable and impossible to engage in so we always lose

#### Drop the Debater –

#### [1] sets a precedent that debaters wont be abusive

#### [2] DTA is the same since you drop the aff

#### Voters:

#### [1] Fairness – constitutive to the judge to decide the better debater, only fairness is in your jurisdiction because it skews decision making

#### [2] Education – the only portable education from debate that we care about

#### DTD:

#### [1] it drops the whole AC so dta is the same thing.

#### [2] deters future abuse since wins and losses determine the activity’s direction.

#### Competing Interps:

#### [1] reasonability on t is incoherent: you’re either topical or you’re not – it’s impossible to be 77% topical, links to all limits offense

#### [2] functionally the same as reasonability – we debate over a specified briteline which is a counter interp

#### [3] judge intervention – judge has to intervene on what’s reasonable, creates a race to the bottom where debaters exploit judge tolerance for questionable argumentation.

#### No RVIs

#### [1] illogical for you to get offense just for being fair – it’s the 1ac’s burden

#### [2] baiting - rvi’s incentivize debaters to read abusive positions to win off theory

## 2

### NC – Thesis

#### The affirmative has mystified the condition of violence. It has colluded in liberal efforts at pacification by portraying war and the ills of society as individual aberrations in (il)liberal nation-state competition and world-making. The affirmative’s rush to existential magnitude in debate persists in a settler-colonial ordering of who controls the justification for violence, wherein the colonized are bound to pathology, but extracted for “value”.

Baron et. al 19 – [(Ilan Zvi, Associate Professor in the School of Government and International Affairs at Durham University; Jonathan Havercroft is an Associate Professor in International Political Theory at the University of Southampton; Isaac Kamola is assistant professor of political science at Trinity College; Jonneke Koomen is Associate Professor of Politics, Sociology and Women’s and Gender Studies at Willamette University; Alex Prichard is senior lecturer in International Relations at the University of Exeter) “Liberal Paciﬁcation and the Phenomenology of Violence,” March 2019, pg. 204-206] TDI //cut wwajd

The Romans understood violence as a necessary condition for pax. The liberal imagination blinds itself to the ways that paciﬁcation functions as violence in our world order. International relations scholarship’s strict distinction between peace and violence reinforces this obfuscation. Yet, the violence of (and in) paciﬁcation is central to the contemporary world. A phenomenological approach shows that moments of violent rupture are not aberrations of the world order. Violent outbreaks are breakdowns of paciﬁcation. It follows that multiple structures of the world order function as the violence of paciﬁcation, of pacavere.12 These structures include liberal capitalism, colonialism and the postcolonial aftermath, and war. Each functions as a key site of paciﬁcation. Anarchist thought reveals the paciﬁcation in liberal capitalism. Postcolonial thought reveals the paciﬁcation of colonial projects. Both anarchist and postcolonial thought demonstrate how war is a breakdown of paciﬁcation, revealing the hidden violent structures of our worldhood.

Anarchist critiques of capitalism, unlike Marxist and liberal interpretations, take seriously the decisive role of state violence in structuring society and markets. Anarchists view the state as an institution that sustains elite appropriations of political and economic power (Proudhon [1861] 1998; Sorel 1999; Prichard 2015). Those at the bottom of the social hierarchy bear the costs of this enforced order. The state diffuses violence (paciﬁcation) throughout the entire society—often in ways that go unrecognized by its subjects (Sorel 1999, 65). The naturalization of violence consolidates arbitrary regimes of domination in society. While speciﬁc, countable incidents of violence may decline, the social order is largely premised on the threat of violence for contravening social norms making speciﬁc, countable incidents of violence relatively rare (Kinna and Prichard, forthcoming).

Anarchist thinkers view rising inequality in the context of declining riots, insurgencies, and assassinations (see Figure 1) as evidence of paciﬁcation. Incidents of proletarian violence, anticolonial violence, riots, and protests are all examples of resistance to the “regimes of domination” that shape contemporary society, regimes easily identiﬁable by those subject to them (Gordon 2007, 33). Drawing on these accounts, we interpret declining rates of riots as a sign of increased paciﬁcation, rather than evidence that the system is becoming less violent. Conversely, eruptions of antistate and anticapitalist direct violence are signs of a breakdown in paciﬁcation. Much like Heidegger’s example of broken equipment (1962, 102–3, 412–13), which draws our attention to the background structures of our world, brief instances of direct violence reveal violently structured social relations.

Although the liberal imagination obscures the centrality of violence, violence has always been central to the liberal world order—to the liberal worldhood—particularly during the colonial and imperial projects of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Bell 2007a, 2007b). Colonial violence was diffused throughout the entire society, often in ways that went unrecognized by the colonized themselves. The violence of paciﬁcation structured the very existence of the colonized subject. This violence transformed the colonized subjects into a different “species” (Fanon 1963, 35– 40, 43). Colonial paciﬁcation was more than direct and indirect violence; it was sufﬁciently diffuse to remake the psyche of the colonized, affecting their mental health and emotions (Fanon 1963, 35–106). Fanon (1963, 31) described it as “atmospheric violence,” a “violence rippling under the skin.” Unable to lashout against the colonizer, the colonized lived everyday within a world ordered by violence. In this world, the colonized could not respond to the colonizers for fear of directly violent reprisals and would turn to symbolic activities such as a dance circle to expose the violence experienced on a daily basis (Fanon 1963, 57). For the colonized, rituals such as the dance were a means of expressing existential frustrations with and resistance to the violence of colonial paciﬁcation through reenactments of direct violence. Ultimately, anticolonial struggles exposed the violence of colonialism by directing that violence back on its authors. Practices of colonial rule were central to developing liberal norms of sovereignty, as well as to the domination and control of recalcitrant populations whether within Europe, such as the English domination of the Welsh, Irish, and Scots, or outside of Europe by settler colonialists against indigenous populations (Deloria Jr 1974; Anghie 2005; Miller 2006; Havercroft 2008; Shaw 2008; Barkawi and Stanski 2012; Coulthard 2014; Simpson 2014; Lightfoot 2016; Rueda-Saiz 2017). This civilizing imagination functioned phenomenologically. It produced insiders as civilized and peaceful and outsiders as violent, external threats to civilization. In doing so, this imagination successfully obscured how the structures of liberalism produced colonial violence.13

The idea of war as an external practice of states, not tied to their internal workings and located according to speciﬁc normative projections of Western identity, followed from this colonial mentality. This mentality legitimized the exporting of violence to create a Western imperial pax and was so widespread that it shaped the development of modern warfare (Ellis 1986; Proudhon [1861] 1998). The colonial wars reproduced and reinforced ideologies of Western superiority, evidenced in part by the West’s superior military technology. A consequence of this racist hubris was the inability to foresee the destructive tendencies of Western warfare when unleashed against themselves (Ellis 1986). The discipline of international relations, founded in response to the unexpectedly destructive character of the First World War, reproduced this understanding of war.14 This understanding disguises the possibility of increasing violence within the liberal world by presuming a historical narrative of progress and being shocked by its aberration. War, however, is not the absence of peace or an aberration of liberal progress, but is instead a phenomenological breaking of the liberal worldhood.15 Once a liberal order of democracy, free markets, and international institutions are spread throughout the world, liberal ideology imagines peace as the end state. Yet, states often deploy war under liberal guises.16 Wars under the aegis of humanitarian values and regime change are examples of the multifaceted character of liberal paciﬁcation. Liberal regimes emphasize the violence of those that they are invading, while minimizing the violence involved in these military undertakings and the violence necessary to sustain the liberal societies themselves. What Pierre-Joseph Proudhon called “the moral phenomenology of war” (Prichard 2015, 112–34; Proudhon [1861] 1998) becomes an integral part of the everyday workings of society that shape innumerable aspects of our daily language. The upshot is that, within liberal ideology, the violence committed by liberal states is justiﬁed, whereas the violence committed by illiberal states is not.

Postcolonial and anarchist scholarship focuses on the incorporation of violence in the production of liberal spaces (Barkawi and Laffey 1999). These same concerns can be directed onto the liberal order itself. Seen from the perspective of marginalized and oppressed populations, the structures of liberal paciﬁcation take on a distinctly violent aspect. The liberal world is not less violent. Rather, the liberal world involves a sophisticated phenomenological process of legitimating certain types of violence in order to render other types of violence invisible.

### Link – Multilateralism/Liberal International Order

#### The Liberal International Order that their commitment to multilateralism upholds is one that breeds explicitly settler colonial ideology, which is how presidents like Trump get produced and conservative policy gets produced. That means our critique controls a stronger internal link to a foreign policy impact than the aff does because it’s the United States that produces the crises that they are talking about through the pathologization of colonized subjects and countries that differ in class ideology.

Parmar 18 – [(Inderjeet, Professor of international politics, and head of the Department of International Politics at City, University of London and an Honorary Research Fellow at the University of Manchester) “The US-led liberal order: imperialism by another name?” 7-26-2018, <https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/images/ia/INTA94_1_9_240_Parmar.pdf>] TDI //cut wwajd

The overall finding is that liberal internationalist thinking/theory is, in effect (albeit unconsciously on the part of its proponents), a legitimating ideology rather than an effective explanatory frame for understanding the way in which the LIO actually works. That conclusion is reached, in part, by suggesting the applicability of a rather different perspective on the operations of the LIO and US power: specifically, a synthesized Gramscian–Kautskyian framework, explained below.

The key point is that the LIO is a class-based, elitist hegemony—strongly imbued with explicit and implicit racial and colonial/imperial assumptions—in both US domestic and foreign relations. At home, this analysis helps to explain in part the phenomenon of the ‘left behind’ white working/middle class, including the affluent but economically anxious voters whose salience on the right has transformed US politics since the Reagan revolution of the 1980s.2 Responding to the (minorities’) rights revolution of the 1960s, and the loss of economic opportunity and decline in living standards due to technological change and the global redistribution of industry,3 white working- and middle-class voters drifted towards the Republicans as the party of low taxes and fiscal conservatism.4 This delivered little in material terms, however; and, as inequality increased with market freedom and real wages stagnated, workers in the ‘rust belt’ and other areas grew increasingly dissatisfied with the status quo of establishment politics, their frustration exacerbated by anxieties about ethno-racial diversity and American identity as the United States moves towards a society in which whites are a minority.5 The result was the election as president in 2016 of Donald Trump on an overtly anti-conservative and barely concealed white identity platform at home and a programme of protectionism and non-interventionism—America First—abroad.6

Yet political dissatisfaction or disaffection was not confined to the political right.7 ‘Occupy Wall Street’ and other movements and groups vented their anger at the inequalities of power, wealth and income, particularly in the wake of the Iraq War and the 2008 financial crisis.8

In external policy, the analysis helps to explain the difficulty, perhaps the impossibility, of the US readily embracing a more diverse international order, as well as the character of that very embrace.9 Accepting nations of the global South on an equal footing may become a strategic necessity, but the process remains problematic given the racialized discourses of western power over the past several centuries, fortified in the United States by the experience of the slave trade, slavery, the ‘Jim Crow’ era, Orientalist views of Asians, and other factors.10 Class power helps to explain the strategic embrace of foreign elites as the sources of change and the agents of American influence, however diluted it may have been due to target states’ national interest considerations. Those at the apex of America’s hierarchies sought to forge alliances with and incorporate their foreign elite counterparts— with their full cooperation—in South Korea and China.11 Hence, the liberal internationalist ‘successes’ in the cases of South Korea and China must be qualified by considering the repercussions of developing market-oriented societies marked by economic inequality, rising social unrest and varying degrees of political repression. In ‘successful’ China and South Korea, as in India and other emerging powers, there remain major challenges underpinned by profound inequalities in power, wealth and income, associated with a politics that is frequently class-based but also heavily racialized and xenophobic.12

### Link – COVID

#### Science proves that framing COVID-19 as an existential threat makes people anxious and gets coopted to justify blatant prejudice against Chinese people.

Tabri, Hollingshead, and Wohl 20 – [(Nassim, Department of Psychology, Carleton University; Samantha, Department of Psychology, Carleton University; Michael, Department of Psychology, Carleton University) “Framing COVID-19 as an Existential Threat Predicts Anxious Arousal and Prejudice towards Chinese People,” 3-29-2020, pg. 12-14] TDI //cut wwajd

Results reported herein are consistent with prior research that found perceived threat of a viral illness pandemic to be positively associated with worry and feelings of anxiety (e.g., Bults et al., 2011; Marshall et al., 2012; Wheaton et al., 2012). However, the extant research has been correlational in nature, thus undermining any causal inferences. In the current research, we showed that framing COVID-19 as an existential threat elicited anxious arousal expressed through acute anxiety symptoms, feelings of state anxiety, and collective angst. Thus, when COVID-19 is perceived as an existential threat it can place people at risk for developing distress and possibly anxiety disorders. The reason is that one of the three pathways to fear and anxiety disorders involves the transmission of information about threats to survival (Rachman, 1977). These findings are in line with research showing that greater exposure to media content about terrorist threat (Bodas, Siman-Tov, Kreitler, et al., 2015) or a virus outbreak (Thompson et al., 2017)) is associated with greater distress and elevated symptoms of acute anxiety. Of note, some symptoms of acute anxiety mimic many of the symptoms of COVID-19 (e.g., difficulty breathing).

An important direction for future research would be a longitudinal assessment of how COVID-19 related existential anxiety ebbs and flows over time and whether existential anxiety has prognostic importance for understanding the onset and maintenance of anxiety and stress-related disorders. If existential anxiety is sustained, it may have a host of psychological, physiological, and behavioral ramification that could be witnessed on a global scale for years to come. In other words, a mental health pandemic may follow this physical health pandemic.

Anxious arousal also has social consequences. It leads to attitudes and action tendencies that are deemed capable of reducing or eliminating the existential threat (see Barlow, 1988; Becker, 1973/2007; Wohl et al., 2012). In the current research, we showed one outcome of COVID-19 related anxious arousal is blatant prejudice against Chinese people. This may have both short- and long-term negative consequences for social capital (i.e., the networks of relationships among people who live and work in a particular society; Putnam, 2000), which can further degrade people’s health and well-being (Elgar et al., 2011). One way to help mitigate the negative consequences of COVID-19 based prejudice is to disseminate information to the general public about how and why people should feel less personally vulnerable to infection should they come into contact with Chinese people or their compatriots of Asian descent (Wohl et al., 2012).

### NC – Alt

#### Pacification, which the affirmative is shot through with, upholds the violent ordering practices of liberalism and conditions life as fraught with suffering. Thus, the alternative is an insurgency against pacification.

Baron et. al 19 – [(Ilan Zvi, Associate Professor in the School of Government and International Affairs at Durham University; Jonathan Havercroft is an Associate Professor in International Political Theory at the University of Southampton; Isaac Kamola is assistant professor of political science at Trinity College; Jonneke Koomen is Associate Professor of Politics, Sociology and Women’s and Gender Studies at Willamette University; Alex Prichard is senior lecturer in International Relations at the University of Exeter) “Liberal Paciﬁcation and the Phenomenology of Violence,” March 2019, pg. 206-207] TDI //wwajd

What does it mean to apply this third type of violence to our understanding of international relations? Paciﬁcation reveals liberalism as a violent process as opposed to a system that is emblematic of the absence of direct violence. There are parallels between the Pax Britannia, Pax Americana, and the ancient peace of the Pax Romana (Neocleous 2010, 13). However, our account emphasizes the crucial role of paciﬁcation as a distinct kind of violence in maintaining these paciﬁc orders. Our theory offers the novel insight that incorporating paciﬁcation into the analysis of the liberal peace reveals crucial aspects of this peace that conventional and critical accounts neglect.

A focus on paciﬁcation provides three critical insights. First, it recovers the crucial role of paciﬁcation in the historical founding of the liberal order. Second, by distinguishing between three kinds of violence (Figure 2), we account for the empirical observations of the liberal peace as leading to a decline in direct violence and an increase in violence overall as part of the paciﬁcation of the Pax Americana. Conversely, the liberal version of the Pax Americana cannot account for key anomalies. Third, our approach draws attention to the violent ordering of social relations. This dimension of violence is neglected even in Marxist, postcolonial, neo-Gramscian, and post-structuralist critiques of the liberal peace, which primarily focus on the role of direct and indirect violence in maintaining the Pax Americana.

Contemporary liberal international relations theory emphasizes the nonviolent role of the liberal triad (democracy, free markets, and institutions) in causing the liberal peace. Yet, a quick review of the history of liberalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries shows that key ﬁgures in liberalism, from John Stuart Mill, to Joseph Galliéni, to American foreign policy elites, understood paciﬁcation as a necessary step in establishing and maintaining the liberal order.

Mill, one of the philosophical founders of liberalism, conceptualized and deployed liberalism as a domination strategy. Mill argued that it is appropriate to impose despotism or slavery on “savages” who incline to “ﬁghting and rapine,” but the government should use force as little as possible:

What they require is not a government of force, but one of guidance. Being, however, in too low a state to yield to the guidance of any but those to whom they look up as the possessors of force, the sort of government ﬁttest for them is one [that] possesses force, but seldom uses it. (Mill 1998, 232–33)

In terms of our conceptual distinction, Mill argued that liberalism as paciﬁcation was a more effective instrument of violence than the direct modes of violence that governments usually deploy.

The history of European colonialism is replete with this line of reasoning. “[L]iberal improvement” was a regular plank of colonial strategy by France and Britain in the nineteenth century (Owens 2015, 154). Consider one example from the French colonial tradition. Galliéni, a military commander and administrator, consciously deployed liberalism as a domination strategy in the paciﬁcation of Tonkin during the 1890s. Galliéni’s strategy involved slowly spreading military outposts and deploying civil administrators to create markets, schools, and amenities. The rationale was that locals would gain a personal interest in the continuation of French control and would help to quell Chinese brigandage. “Piracy,” said Galliéni, “is the result of an economic condition. It can be fought by prosperity” (quoted in Owens 2015, 157). Galliéni devised a “theory of paciﬁcation” in which “the correct combination of force and politics can socialize, pacify, and domesticate a population into regulating itself” (quoted in Owens 2015, 157). What Mill proposed in theory, Galliéni enacted in practice; paciﬁcation—the violent reordering of social relations in a colony—was a more effective means of maintaining liberal rule than the deployment of direct violence.

While less explicit, the relationship between liberalism and imperialism remained present in the twentieth-century development of the Pax Americana. During this era, US policy makers sought to construct a zone of peace distinct from the zones of war associated with authoritarian regimes. The US State Department ﬁrst recognized the concept of “hegemonic paciﬁcation” in the Euro-Atlantic conference diplomacy of the 1920s (Cohrs 2008, 619). The United States’ “strategic restraint” in the aftermath of World War Two was motivated by this concept of liberal, hegemonic paciﬁcation (Ikenberry 2009; Ikenberry 2011, 173). US defense ofﬁcials Stimson, Patterson, McCloy, and Assistant Secretary Howard C. Peterson agreed that it was a matter of the security interests of the United States to maintain “open markets, unhindered access to raw materials, and the rehabilitation of much—if not all—of Eurasia along liberal capitalist lines” (Lefﬂer 1984, 349–56; Barkawi and Laffey 1999). Liberalism as a domination and pacifying strategy continued throughout (and long after) the Cold War (Laffey 2003; Stokes 2003), as evident in one of the founding documents of the post–World War Two liberal order, NSC-68 (Ikenberry 2011, 168). While the enforcement of a Pax Americana eventually yielded a decline in direct violence, it produced an increase in other types of violence. The ﬁrst insight of our theory is that paciﬁcation has always been part of the liberal project and that the violence in the liberal project never went away.

The second insight is that by reinterpreting the liberal peace as liberal paciﬁcation we are able to grant the empirical ﬁndings of liberal peace theorists while maintaining that the Pax Americana represents an intensiﬁcation of violence overall. In the language of positivist social science, our theory is observationally equivalent to that of liberal peace theory. We expect that the quantity of direct violence inversely associates with the degree of paciﬁcation in a society. Therefore, our interpretation challenges research that identiﬁes liberal institutions as the cause of declining violence. Liberal institutions, as apparatuses of liberal paciﬁcation, ensure that direct violence is increasingly rare while leaving the structures of violence and domination in place. The observational equivalence on particular dependent variables (in our case, all forms of direct violence) produces a theoretical change requiring the generation of novel observable implications (King, Keohane, and Verba 1994, 30).

Furthermore, increased suffering in liberal societies provides evidence contradicting the main claims of liberal peace theories, while remaining consistent with liberal paciﬁcation. At its core, liberalism is a project that tries to maximize the utility of its subjects (in other words, minimize suffering while maximizing happiness). As such, a state of liberal peace should lead to a decrease in markers of suffering. However, there is more slavery in the world today than ever before, with conservative estimates of between 12.3 and 27 million people in debt bondage, chattel, or contract slavery (Gordon 2012).17 Moreover, there is ample evidence of rising psychological disorders in liberal societies. A preponderance of evidence from the United States suggests that depression, anxiety, alienation, opioid dependency, stress, other related psychological disorders, increased social isolation, and the decline of community have increased throughout the twentieth century (Twenge, Zhang, and Im 2004, 320; Adler, Boyce, Chesney, et al. 1994; Twenge 2000; Twenge, Konrath, Foster, et al. 2008; Twenge, Gentile, DeWall, et al. 2010; Cohen and Janicki-Deverts 2012; American Society of Addiction Medicine 2016). Changes to human life associated with modernity have caused psychological stress to increase (Jackson 2014). Mortality rates have increased for some white, non-Hispanics aged 45–54 in the United States between 1999 and 2013 (Case and Deaton 2015). Modern technological advances from television to the Internet may contribute to increasing separation and alienation of the social human animal into individualized bodies connected by increasingly weak and empty bonds (Putnam 2000; Gray 2011; Turkle 2011). At minimum, new information communication technology such as Facebook can increase the stress and anxiety of its users (Lee-Won, Herzog, and Park 2015). The violent structuring of liberalism enables increases in social alienation, anxiety, stress, and human bondage through repression, economic control, and social isolation.

These are not isolated instances of suffering. They are fundamental structural features of our liberal world. If liberalism is a process of paciﬁcation rather than simply peace, then this rise in individual suffering in liberal spaces may be evidence of a similar process that Fanon equated with the psychic life of the colonist. Just as Fanon’s colonial subjects, unable to lash out at the settler through direct violence, internalized their suffering, modern liberal subjects, unable to resist liberal paciﬁcation, internalize their suffering (1982, chap. 6; cf.Sorel 1999, 118). Liberal peace should bring about a rise in happiness; that it has instead led to rising suffering is evidence of liberal paciﬁcation.

Third, in addition to offering an alternative interpretation of the liberal peace, our theory of liberal paciﬁcation supplements key insights from critical approaches to peace. Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey’s work on imperial processes and liberal spaces makes a similar point to ours, that the celebrated zone of liberal peace rests on practices of violence (Barkawi and Laffey 1999, 2002; cf. Neocleous et al. 2013). Their account, however, focuses on practices of direct violence, such as humanitarian interventions against authoritarian regimes or corporations hiring local militias to make work sites in the global south safe for economic extraction (Barkawi and Laffey 1999, 422). Our point is that these moments of direct violence lead to paciﬁcation wherein social relations have been so violently reordered as to make direct violence no longer necessary. Once direct violence has established liberal space, paciﬁcation functions as a structure of violence that sustains the space. Direct violence only manifests itself when paciﬁcation weakens.

#### This evidence describes what that process will look like---a complete de-securisation of society mobilized through an ethic of mutual aid and a reconfigured social schema in the face of fascism.

Karatzogianni and Robinson 17 – [(Athina, Associate Professor in Media and Communication at the University of Leicester; Andrew is an independent scholar) “Schizorevolutions versus microfascisms: The fear of anarchy in state securitization,” 7-20-2017, pg. 10-11] TDI //cut wwajd

If the security state is able to wrest control from global capital and from active and reactive networks, fascism is the likely outcome. In a new twist on the old Marxist tale of the means of production outstripping the social relations which produce them, capitalism now produces technologies which enable the exercise of diffuse power, at the same time as trying in increasingly paranoid ways to restrict them. The existing technologies vital to contemporary capitalism – such as the Internet, global travel and financial flows – are already profiled as ‘risks’ in securitisation discourse (which in many ways reflects a backlash by the state against the loss of control suffered under 1990s liberalisation). New technologies underpinning any economic revival – such as mass-market drones, artificial intelligence, three-dimensional (3D) printing, distributed ledger technologies, biological self-modification – pose even greater ‘risks’ which may prove uncontrollable. If the deep state continues to see security as the bottom line, it may ultimately have to rupture with its global capitalist allies and impose a similar generalised chilling of social life and antiproduction against unregulated flows, including those unleashed by capitalism.

There are several alternatives, all of which require de-securitising society. First, the system could switch from a subtraction to an addition of axioms approach, using social policy rather than securitisation/militarisation to respond to ‘risks’. Second, people could seek security in diffuse rather than concentrated power, moving towards smaller-scale, more densely networked patterns of life and work, which reduce both the anxiety underpinning securitisation and risks originating from global flows. Third, the securitisation system itself is ineffective so new visions developed are needed for creating possibilities for trust-building and conflict transformation in the situations of systemically produced scarcity which currently generate ‘risk’. A Clastrean balance of power among diffuse social actors, or a situation of mutual tolerance based on a global ethic of valuing locality and diversity, might succeed in keeping relations among empowered diffuse groups largely peaceful.

On the other side, we should find hope in the proliferation of resistance among the excluded. We need to see in movements of the excluded the radical potential and not only the reactive distortions. To take Tupac Shakur’s metaphor, we need to see the rose that grows from concrete, not merely the thorns. The problem is, rather, that many of the movements on the network side of the equation are still thinking, seeing and feeling like states. Such movements are potential bearers of the Other of the state-form, of networks as alternatives to states, affinity against hegemony, abundance against scarcity. Hence, as Vaneigem (1967) argues, ‘[t]o work for delight and authentic festivity is barely distinguishable from preparing for a general insurrection’ (1967: 50–51). It has been argued in utopian studies that fear and hope form part of a continuum, expressing ‘aspects of affective ambivalence’ connected to the indeterminacy of the future (McManus, 2005). The type of hope needed is active and immanent, brought into the present as a propulsive force rather than deferred to the future. Deleuze and Guattari use the term ‘absolute deterritorialisation’ for this possibility.

In his work on conflict transformation, John Paul Lederach emphasises the need to turn negative energies into creative energies and mobilising hope against fear (Lederach, 2005; Lederach and Maiese, n.d.: 2–3). How is this change in vital energies to be accomplished? Deleuze and Guattari (1983) invoke a figure of the shaman as a way to overcome reactive energies (1983: 67–68). They call for a type of revolutionary social movement ‘that follows the lines of escape of desire; breaches the wall and causes flows to move; assembles its machines and its groups-in-fusion in the enclaves or at the periphery’, countering reactive energies (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 277). As Zevnik (2016) discusses, disrupting scopic regimes involves moments of anxiety, where the anxious gaze puts one’s identity and one’s places in the social fantasy under question (2016: 133). Countering reactive energies while belonging to a hierarchical productive structure involves a dismantlement of the illusion, while ‘subjectification is never without a black hole in which its lodges its consciousness, passions and redundancies’ (Zevnik, 2016: 133).

Hence, it is in open spaces, safe spaces and spaces of dialogue that hope can be found to counter the spiral of terror. This opening of space, this creation of autonomous zones, should be viewed as a break with the majoritarian logics of social control. The coming ‘other worlds’ counterposed to the spaces of terror are not an integrated ‘new order’, but rather a proliferation of smooth spaces in a horizontality without borders. These ‘other worlds’ are being built unconsciously, wherever networks, affinity and hope counterpose themselves to state terror and the desire for fixed identity be it national, ethnic, religious or cultural. It is in the incommensurable antagonism between the autonomous zones of these ‘other worlds’ and the terror-state’s demands for controlled spaces to serve capital that the nexus of the conflicts of the present and near-future lies.

## 3

#### The counterfeit medicine market is attracting new suppliers, but new technologies are evolving to crack down on counterfeits – it’s prevalence is tentative

Hallie B Forcinio 21 [Hallie Forcinio is BioPharm International's packaging editor, editorhal@sbcglobal.net . PharmTech, 2-2-2021, "Countering Counterfeiters and Diverters," https://www.pharmtech.com/view/countering-counterfeiters-and-diverters]//anop

The never-ending battle against counterfeit pharmaceutical products has become fiercer with the pandemic. With product protection a constant concern, the market for anticounterfeiting technologies is strong, regulatory efforts are ongoing, and authentication and anticounterfeiting technologies are evolving. As a result, the anticounterfeiting packaging market is projected to grow at a 7.8% compound annual growth rate to $189.9 billion in 2026 (1). A major driver for this growth is the expanding use of e-commerce platforms, which make it easy to set up shop to sell fraudulent products and are largely unregulated. A study by Local Circles noted that approximately 20% of all products sold on e-commerce sites are counterfeit (1). Anticounterfeiting laws and regulations, such as the European Union’s Falsified Medicine Directive and the US’s Drug Supply Chain Security Act (DSCSA), safeguard prescription drugs available from pharmacies. “However, pharmaceutical manufacturers should be aware that these measures alone will not guarantee a product’s integrity and authenticity,” says Gene Dul, president of Schreiner MediPharm US. He says, “Only additional counterfeit-proof authenticity features can provide a comprehensive approach against fraud, misuse, and tampering.” Unfortunately, the coronavirus pandemic has increased the opportunities for counterfeiting. “In a survey issued by IDC in June 2020, 70% of companies agreed that their supply chain is ‘very vulnerable’ to suffering more problems if the COVID-19 crisis lasted more than a couple of months longer, and 75% of companies agreed that the COVID-19 pandemic has ‘greatly increased/will greatly increase’ problems with diversion, theft, and counterfeiting of critical products such as test kits, vaccines, and antivirals,” reports Aimee Genzler, vice-president, Corporate & Brand Communications at TraceLink, the study sponsor (2). In fact, in anticipation of a spike in counterfeiting, the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement Homeland Security Investigations (HSI) has launched Operation Stolen Promise 2, to halt the production, distribution, and sale of illicit COVID-19 treatments and vaccines. HSI reported that its agents have seized illicit proceeds and goods, made arrests, and shut down fraudulent websites (3), including the seizure of two domain names in December 2020 (4). The proliferation of counterfeit goods stems in part from the shift to e-commerce, which has been accelerated by stay-at-home orders and advisories and reduced access to physical retail pharmacies. “The emergence of on-line pharmacies poses a significant threat of escalation in counterfeit pharmaceuticals and underscores the urgent need for on-dose countermeasures,” reports Peter Wong, chief operating officer at TruTag Technologies, which recently entered a partnership with Colorcon to provide advanced security coatings for on-dose use. “Counterfeiters are opportunistic,” explains John Pitts, key account manager for Antares Vision, noting, “COVID-19 provided the ‘perfect storm’ for the counterfeiters: panic in consumers; product shortages from the brand name ethical providers; desire and, in many cases, requirement to purchase via e-commerce; and lack of and often conflicting information from the media and authorities.” Joe Farrell, life sciences expert at Loftware, concurs, “It seems clear that whenever there are high-value pharmaceutical products, there will be people trying to profit illegally. The fact that the COVID-19 vaccines need to be shipped in stringent cold storage containers with radio frequency identification (RFID) temperature sensors along with specialized transportation methods will make it more difficult for counterfeiters to enter the supply chain, but not impossible.” With COVID-19 vaccines now rolling out in limited quantities, demand will outstrip supply in the coming months. “This will create a ripe environment for unscrupulous parties to offer fake product,” says Wong, noting, “Distribution of the COVID-19 vaccine is designed to go to many more points of dispensing than for a normal pharmaceutical drug, as governments seek to deliver vaccinations broadly and as quickly as possible while maintaining demanding cold-chain requirements. These logistical requirements will create higher than normal transition points in the overall supply chain, which in turn create increase opportunities for diversion, adulteration, and fake product to reach the patient.” Counterfeiting countermeasures The pharmaceutical industry has been on the leading edge of anticounterfeiting and brand protection efforts for many years. “Anticounterfeit solutions are usually tailor-made according to the needs of the brand owner,” says Paavo Sillanpää, senior business manager, Pharma at UPM Raflatac. A diverse strategy considering threat scenario and product is needed. “Most pharma companies have a multi-layered approach,” notes Farrell. The most common physical solutions are tamper-evident labels and packaging materials, designs that prevent the placement of a counterfeit product into the original packaging, serialization, and overt and covert authentication methods such as holograms, invisible markers, and taggants. “Ideally, multi-level security concepts should be used that are individually tailored to a specific use case, combining analog and digital features, which can be verified by different stakeholders within the supply chain,” says Dul. There is heightened interest in tools and technologies that go beyond the package to protect patients, such as on-dose solutions. In addition, says Wong, “the industry is increasing its public awareness campaigns of the problem of fake and unsafe medicine in an effort to educate consumers about the dangers of unauthentic drug products.” As a result, Pitts predicts an increased focus on consumer engagement. He notes, “Enabling the end consumer and the dispenser to authenticate their products is powerful on so many levels. It makes counterfeiting more difficult, provides vital and real-time data to the consumer, and can offer the manufacturer feedback.” Labeling technologies Labeling plays an important role in the fight against counterfeit products. As the passport for moving products through the global supply chain, it contains any track-and-trace or authentication information. “In the label business, we have seen an increased interest in various tamper-evident (TE) solutions and holograms,” reports Sillanpää. One new product from UPM Raflatac combines heat resistance, advanced adhesion, and conformability. Designed primarily for the European market where cartoned blister packaging is common, the heat-resistant TE label won’t shrink in heat tunnels used to produce multipacks. UPM Raflatac has also introduced sustainable TE labeling. It’s produced from Forest Film, which Sillanpää says is “the world’s first wood-based plastic labeling material.” Benefits include performance equivalent to traditional plastic film label materials and the ability to help pharmaceutical brands achieve sustainability goals. Demand for more sustainable products extends to RFID and near-field communication (NFC) tags. Eco-friendly RFID and NFC tags from Identiv feature paper-based transponder inlays that reduce polyethylene terephthalate content, resulting in a repulpable substrate (5). RFID technology is integral to the Cap-Lock plus RFID cap adapter and label combination from Schreiner MediPharm. The label-integrated RFID inlay provides digital proof of integrity and first-opening evidence for syringes as well as product authentication. Dul explains, “The adapter is placed on top of the syringe’s primary closure and interlinked with it to equalize the diameter differences of the syringe body and closure. The label wraps around the syringe body and cap adapter and—once opened—provides irreversible tamper evidence due to an integrated perforation.” Printing and tagging technologies Magnetic ink is another potential anticounterfeiting tool. Technology from Inspectron relies on a proprietary reader, track-and-trace software, and magnetic ink, long used on checks to facilitate automated sorting. The magnetic ink is used to print a barcode, which is detectable even if it’s not visible to the eye. That means the code, which may be serialized, can be hidden on the inside of a carton or under a label and still be read. The current reader works from a distance of up to 2 mm, but units with longer read ranges are under development. “However, longer read ranges require bigger codes,” notes Nathalie Muller, head of Innovation at Inspectron. Although the first commercial application of the technology inkjets the codes on paper to enable identification of diverted product, Muller says, the permanent magnetic codes could be printed on plastic or glass containers and potentially support tasks like vial tracking. Also under development is a hybrid one- and two-dimensional barcode that would hold more data. On-dose technology enables authentication at the product level. Edible microparticles coupled with the Smart Medicine solution from TruTag Technologies confirms product authenticity and can help boost patient adherence and outcomes. A new Pharma Mobile App allows patients to scan each dose with their smartphone, authenticate it, and record that it was taken. If desired, the record of the dose can be shared with healthcare providers. The system also can link to other product information. In April 2020, FDA accepted molecular tagging technology from Applied DNA Sciences into its Emerging Technology Program (6). The company says that its technology is a multilayered platform that gives both the dose and the packaging an immutable identity for authentication. On Nov. 30, 2020, AlpVision launched its Alpvision COVID-19 Initiative to protect COVID-19-related therapeutics and vaccines against counterfeiting. Under the program, AlpVision provides pharmaceutical companies and their suppliers with the tools to deploy its Cryptoglyph digital security feature on their packaging. Invisible to the human eye, the Cryptoglyph feature can be authenticated via smartphone. Adopting the technology does not change the production process or involve additional consumables. In addition, the smartphone applications connect to AlpVision’s Brand Monitoring System, a centralized server platform that enables real-time monitoring of product authentication activities. AlpVision plans to provide this service for free until the World Health Organization declares the pandemic has ended (7). Software tools Physical technologies are common anticounterfeiting tools, but counterfeit and diversion prevention also relies on software. Farrell reports, “At Loftware, we are being asked for help in getting the correct information onto the label. It’s important to have an enterprise labeling solution that integrates with a company’s sources of data to make sure the correct approved information is automatically applied to the labels. This includes languages, barcodes, regulatory symbology, and regional product information. You also need a labeling solution that can aid with approving, managing, and promoting electronic information for use [data] to help speed the process for a faster time to market for these critical products.” Although not specifically an anticounterfeiting product, Loftware Spectrum software integrates with serialization solutions and ensures labeling is consistent, accurate, and contains the right serialized data and barcodes. “The use of global templates in an enterprise solution also helps our life sciences customers to globally standardize on the look of their supply chain labels to help identify counterfeited products,” he explains. The scalable Track My Way platform from Antares Vision offers single-unit, batch, and custom traceability; provides direct consumer engagement; and can extend from raw materials tracking to end-of-life package disposal/recycling. Geolocation functionality can track the harvesting of the raw materials, packaging locations, the movement of products through the supply chain, and the point-of-sale location. In April 2020, TraceLink released an anticounterfeiting tool called Smart Distribution Tracking. By integrating the Internet of Things with product serialization, Smart Distribution Tracking provides full track-and-trace visibility for the secure delivery of vaccines, test kits, and high-value products. Another software tool, the Summit Authentication Platform from Microtrace Solutions, is a customized system consisting of a self-authenticating, encrypted barcode; a Spectral Taggant; and a handheld detector plus a smartphone mobile app. “Our Spectral Taggant is a chemistry formulated into an ink that, when printed, is a highly secure ‘signature’ or ‘fingerprint,’” explains Brian Brogger, president at Microtrace Solutions. This signature can be authenticated instantly via the handheld spectrometer or smartphone without an Internet connection. For vaccines and therapeutics, the barcode and Spectral Taggant can be applied to security labels. The mobile app is then able to verify that the barcode was genuinely issued and the Spectral Taggant verifies that the barcode has not been copied. The system also can provide real-time reporting and analysis. The latest release of the Systech Brand Protection Suite from Systech International, the software solutions division of Markem-Imaje, delivers a fully integrated solution to combat counterfeiters, identifies product diversion, meets regulatory compliance, and provides analytics. The centerpiece of the suite, the company’s non-additive e-Fingerprint technology, turns any existing barcode into a unique, digital identifier to provide end-to-end visibility and actionable information as a product moves through the supply chain. New functions include the ability to push unique responses and content to users and smartphone authentication of e-Fingerprinted products. Responses can be tailored to the user, location, time, and safety of the product, and include photos or other information. A new analytics platform, Systech Insight, offers a series of Information on Demand dashboards and an analytics data pool (8).

#### **IP protection prevents and quickly stops spread counterfeit medicines – multiple warrants**

FIFARMA 21, [FIFARMA is the Latin American Federation of the Pharmaceutical Industry created in 1962. We represent 16 research-based biopharmaceutical companies and 11 local associations dedicated to discovering and developing innovative, quality and safe health products and services that improve the lives of patients in Latin America and the Caribbean and advocate for patient-centric, sustainable health systems characterized by high regulatory standards and ethical principles. (Apr 22, 2021), "This is how we fight counterfeit medicines with Intellectual Property," https://fifarma.org/en/this-is-how-we-fight-counterfeit-medicines-with-intellectual-property/]//anop

In addition to functioning as a tool to maintain constant innovation in the industry, IP helps reducing counterfeit medicines because medicines have better technologies and ingredients are more difficult to copy. This means that, through market incentives, the industry manages to have high quality infrastructure, new technology and trained personnel, to create specialized and specific medicines and therapies, which is why they are difficult to replicate. On the other hand, political will functions as another important axis, as it must prosecute those who are making counterfeit medicines. This is achieved through a constant conversation between industry and governments. Therefore, it will be absolutely clear how to identify the authenticity of medicines. In short, IP allows quality standards to be clearer and stricter, and regulators to have greater knowledge and traceability of each product that enters the market. Through IP, you can establish a record of all products globally, which makes it easier to find possible counterfeit medicines. C

#### Pharmaceutical counterfeiting is increasingly used to support terrorism – used for funding and mediums of attacks

née Lybecker 18, Kristina M.L. Acri [Kristina M. L. Acri née Lybecker is an Associate Professor of Economics in the Department of Economics and Business at Colorado College in Colorado Springs, CO. (February 2018), "Pharmaceutical Counterfeiting: Endangering Public Health, Society and the Economy" Fraser Institute, https://www.fraserinstitute.org/sites/default/files/pharmaceutical-counterfeiting-endangering-public-health-society-and-the-economy.pdf]//anop

Pharmaceutical counterfeiting is linked to numerous forms of organized crime: drug trafficking, money laundering, and terrorism (Lybecker, 2016; Pfizer, 2007; Redpath, 2012; Criminal Intelligence Service Canada, 2006; UNODC, 2017). As reported by Redpath (2012: 7), “not only have groups such as the Russian mafia, Colombian drug cartels, Chinese triads and Mexican drug gangs all become heavily involved in producing and trafficking counterfeit drugs over the past decade, but mounting evidence also points to the direct involvement of Hezbollah and al Qaeda.” *Given the profitability of the endeavor, it is not surprising that pharmaceutical counterfeiting is increasingly a source of funding for terrorist groups* (Lybecker, 2016; Pfizer, 2007; Redpath, 2012). Moreover, by their very nature, organized criminal operations are well suited to the intricacies of pharmaceutical counterfeiting. “Criminal organisations have the advantage of huge resources, international networks and skilled labour. They can move with a speed that often confounds the authorities. Counterfeit versions of the antiviral drug Tamiflu were available on fake internet pharmacy sites, like the one posing as the ‘Canadian Pharmacy,’ within weeks of the [World Health Organization] declaration of H1N1 as a pandemic” (Redpath 2012: 8). While anecdotal evidence of the link is quite plentiful, the clandestine nature of the business as well as the secrecy maintained by law enforcement make it virtually impossible to either completely understand or measure the extent of the trade. A 2014 INTERPOL study provides perspective on pharmaceutical crime and organized criminal groups. INTERPOL’s Medical Product Counterfeiting and Pharmaceutical Crime Sub-Directorate has prepared an analysis of available data, dating from 2008 to 2014, to establish the extent of organized criminal groups (OCGs) activity in the realm of pharmaceutical crime (INTERPOL, 2014).5 According to the report, a recent Europol threat assessment concludes that there are “a wide variety of actors, operating within the pharmaceutical crime arena, encompassing both OCGs and individual criminals, both of which are involved at any point in the supply chain.” The report points to the involvement of both traditionally structured hierarchical crime groups in addition to highly organized, yet generally informal, networks of illicit online pharmacies and finally, small groups of three to ten members. The INTERPOL study, as well as those from other agencies, provides some perspective on the involvement of organized criminal groups in Canada. Numerous investigations in the US, Canada, and Sweden have linked the Hell’s Angels to the production and distribution of counterfeit medicines, in particular ED medications and steroids (INTERPOL, 2014). • Fake oxycontin pills containing fentanyl were responsible for more than 50 deaths in Alberta in 2015. The counterfeit pills are also responsible for three deaths in Saskatchewan (Partnership for Safe Medicines, 2015b). • In November 2013, Canadian authorities began an organized crime investigation named “Project Forseti,” targeting the Hells Angels and the Fallen Saints (Customs Today Report, 2015). In January of 2015, police in Saskatchewan and Alberta, Canada seized guns and drugs, including significant amounts of counterfeit oxycontin. A United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI) study suggests that criminal networks use routes and methods to transport counterfeit medicines that are similar to those used to traffic in drugs, firearms, and people (UNICRI, 2012). Evidence suggests that organized criminal gangs involved in the production of synthetic drugs are able to easily access the materials and expertise needed to also produce counterfeit medicines. In both Europe and Southeast Asia, authorities cite evidence of “criminal manufacturers of amphetamine-type substances [that] have been involved in the production and distribution of counterfeit medicines” (INTERPOL, 2014).

#### Terrorism escalates to nuclear war

Ayson 10 (Robert Ayson. Robert Ayson is Professor of Strategic Studies at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, where he works closely with the Centre for Strategic Studies. “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects”. 6-21-2010. Studies in Conflict and Terrorism. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1057610X.2010.483756?journalCode=uter20>) **//TruLe**

But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier) Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents’ … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide. There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could reasonably be expected that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, bothRussia and China would extend immediate sympathy and support to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability.

## Case

### Presumption

#### member nations ALREADY can – vote neg on presumption

**Bacchus**, James. “An Unnecessary Proposal: A WTO Waiver of Intellectual Property Rights for COVID-19 Vaccines.” *Cato.org*, 16 Dec. 20**20**,www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines#balancing-ip-rights-access-medicines-not-new-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](https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines#_ednref6) 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](https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines#_ednref7) 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](https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines#_ednref8)After years of debate, WTO members clarified in the Doha Ministerial Declaration in November 2001 that **each WTO member “has the right to grant compulsory licenses and the freedom to determine the grounds upon which such licenses are granted.”**[9](https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines#_ednref9) In August 2003, WTO members followed up on the 2001 declaration by adopting a waiver that allows poorer countries that do not have the capacity to make pharmaceutical products—and thus cannot benefit from compulsory licensing—to import cheaper generic drugs from countries where those drugs are protected by patent.[10](https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines#_ednref10) In such a case, both the importing and exporting countries are excused from what would otherwise be their obligations under the TRIPS Agreement. This waiver was transformed into an amendment in the WTO IP rules in 2017.[11](https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines#_ednref11)Compulsory licensing of medicines is not popular with private drug manufacturers because it is a derogation from the customary workings of market‐​based capitalism. However, as these actions by WTO members in 2001, 2003, and 2017 illustrate, compulsory licensing is not a derogation from the balance struck by the members of the WTO between protecting IP rights and ensuring access to essential medicines. Rather, it is a crucial part of that balance. The balance struck in the WTO treaty includes the option of compulsory licensing during health emergencies.

#### **Current COVID-19 patent waivers will solve the pandemics advantage and proves sq solves pandemics**

Pti 21 [6-10-2021, "India, South Africa’s patent waiver proposal in WTO achieved tremendous mileage, progression: Commerce Secretary," Hindu, https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/india-south-africas-patent-waiver-proposal-in-wto-achieved-tremendous-mileage-progression-commerce-secretary/article34778668.ece]

The proposal of India and South Africa on providing temporary patent waiver at the World Trade Organisation (WTO) to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic has achieved tremendous mileage and progression as the WTO member countries have agreed to commence text-based negotiations on it, a top government official said on June 10. The Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Council of the World Trade Organization (WTO) on June 9 agreed with consensus to start text-based negotiations on a proposal submitted by India and South Africa seeking patent waivers to deal with the COVID-19 crisis. Commerce Secretary Anup Wadhawan said that the text-based negotiations is the way forward and it means that the members have broadly and in-principle accepted the objective behind the waiver proposal. “India and South Africa’s proposal has achieved tremendous mileage and tremendous progression at a very fast pace,” he told reporters. “There is a deadline that by July-end, the members are expected to come to an agreed text. So it is a very positive development,” he added. How the objective will be given effect and to what extent and for how much duration, all that would happen though text-based negotiations, the Secretary noted. In October 2020, India and South Africa had submitted the first proposal suggesting a waiver for all WTO members on the implementation of certain provisions of the TRIPS Agreement in relation to the prevention, containment or treatment of COVID-19. In May this year, a revised proposal was submitted by 62 co-sponsors, including India, South Africa, and Indonesia. The agreement on TRIPS came into effect in January 1995. It is a multilateral agreement on intellectual property (IP) rights such as copyright, industrial designs, patents and protection of undisclosed information or trade secrets. According to the revised proposal of 62 co-sponsors, the waiver should be in force for at least three years from the date of the decision on the matter. The co-sponsors have stated that the duration has to be practical for manufacturing to be feasible and viable. The revised text has also proposed waiver for health products and technologies as the prevention, treatment or containment of COVID-19 which involves a range of things and “intellectual property issues may arise with respect to the products and technologies, their materials or components, as well as their methods and means of manufacture.”

#### **Vote neg on presumption – the aff can’t solve any of their impacts – facilities don’t exist**
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The U.S.’s stunning endorsement of a proposal to waive Covid-19 vaccine patents has won plaudits for President Biden and roiled the global pharmaceutical industry. But, at least in the short term, it’s likely to be more of a symbolic milestone than a turning point in the pandemic. For months, proponents of the proposal have argued that the need to waive intellectual property protections was urgent given the growth of Covid cases in low- and middle-income countries, which have been largely left without the huge shipments of vaccine already purchased by wealthy countries. But patents alone don’t magically produce vaccines. Experts suggested the earliest the world could expect to see additional capacity flowing from the waiver — if it’s approved at the World Trade Organization — would be in 2022. Prashant Yadav, a supply chain expert and senior fellow at the Center for Global Development, said the biggest barrier to increasing the global vaccine supply is a lack of raw materials and facilities that manufacture the billions of doses the world needs. Temporarily suspending some intellectual property, as the U.S. proposes to do, would have little effect on those problems, he said. “My take is: By itself, it will not get us much benefit in increased manufacturing capacity,”