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## 1

CP Text: Member nations of the World Trade Organization should create patent pool licensing platforms for medicines.

#### Solves access and avoids disads.

Stramiello 18 [(Michael, PhD, an intellectual property litigation associate in Washington, DC. His practice focuses on the life sciences industry) “CRISPR: The New Frontier of Biotechnology Innovation” American Bar Association, Jan/Feb 2018. https://www.americanbar.org/groups/intellectual\_property\_law/publications/landslide/2017-18/january-february/crispr-new-frontier-biotechnology-innovation-digital-feature/]//pranav

As CRISPR marches on, there may be an elegant solution for making it widely available without government intervention in licensing: patent pools. These joint licensing platforms enable owners to combine their IP rights into bundles that are made accessible, nonexclusively, to a broad range of users via a single transaction with predictable terms. As a result, licensors and licensees can concentrate on innovation and commercial development, respectively, while minimizing transaction costs and litigation risk.32 This model was popularized in the 1990s, when the consumer electronics industry adopted it to facilitate deployment of the MPEG-2 digital video standard, which has yielded about $5 trillion in worldwide product sales since 1997.33 A key coordinator of that effort, MPEG LA LLC, now invites CRISPR/Cas9 patent holders to participate in their own pool. MPEG LA has been gauging interest from CRISPR rights holders since at least April 2017.34 Broad and Rockefeller University announced that they had submitted nearly two dozen “key CRISPR-Cas9 patents,”35 from 10 families, “for evaluation of eligibility to participate in discussions facilitated by MPEG LA regarding creation of a CRISPR Joint Licensing Platform.”36 UC reportedly has no plans to follow suit, citing potential conflicts with its existing licenses.37 The effect that pooling would have on such arrangements may remain unclear until contributors finalize pool terms, which could take years. Early efforts might focus on pooling foundational patents, and there has also been speculation about specialized pools geared toward particular CRISPR applications (e.g., agriculture and industrial biotechnology).38 Pooling may prove to be more of a challenge with respect to human therapeutics, a field where rights holders typically expect exclusivity as a reward for their enormous investment in rigorous clinical trials.

## 2

CP Text: The United States federal government should maintain status quo intellectual property protections for medicines. All other member nations of the World Trade organization should reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.

The United States should:

- substantially increase production and global distribution of the COVID-19 Vaccine to low-income countries.

- cooperate with allies to achieve increased production and global distribution of the COVID-19 Vaccine.

All other member nations should increase production of the COVID-19 vaccine.

#### That solves better – IP rights don’t hinder vaccine cooperation, but manufacturing capacity is the current constraint.

Hans Sauer 6-17 [(Deputy General Counsel, Biotechnology Industry Organization.) “Web event — Confronting Joe Biden’s proposed TRIPS waiver for COVID-19 vaccines and treatments” https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/210617-Confronting-Joe-Bidens-proposed-TRIPS-waiver.pdf?x91208&x91208] TDI

But contrary to what Lori said, **there are genuine real problems in the supply chain** that are **not caused by patents**, that are simply caused by the unavailability and the constraints on existing capacity. There is in this world such a thing as maxed-out capacity that just can’t be increased on a dime. It’s not all due to intellectual property. This is true for existing vaccines as well as for vaccine raw materials. There are trade barriers. There are export restrictions that we should all be aware of and that we need to work on. And there are very real political, I think, interests in finding an explanation for how we got to this place that absolve governments around the world from their own policy decisions that they made in the past. In the United States, again, it was the declared policy of the previous administration, as well as this one, that we would vaccinate healthy college kids and go all down the line and offer a vaccine to everybody who wants it before we start sharing any with grandmothers in Burkina Faso. That was the policy. You can agree with it or disagree with it, but that was policy. We had export restrictions in place before a lot of other countries did. And that, too, contributed to unequal access of vaccines around the world. Another thing that was predictable was that politicians and governments around the world who want to be seen as proactive, on the ball, in control, for a long time were actually very indecisive, very unsure about how to address the COVID problem, which has so many dimensions. Vaccines are only one of those. But with respect to vaccines, not many governments took decisive action, put money on the table, put bets on multiple horses, before we knew whether these vaccines would work, would be approved. And it was governments in middle-income countries who now, I think, justifiably are concerned that they’re not getting fast enough access, who didn’t have the means and who didn’t have the decision-making structure to place the same bets on multiple horses, if you will, that were placed in the relatively more wealthy, global North and global West. But there is, I think, a really good and, with hindsight, predictable explanation of how we got to this place, and I think it teaches us something about how to fix the problem going forward. **So why will the waiver not work**? Well, first of all, with complex technology like vaccines, Lori touched on it, reverse engineering, like you would for a small molecule drug, is much more difficult if not impossible. But it depends very much more than small molecule drugs on cooperation, on voluntary transfer of technology, and on mutual assistance. We have seen as part of the pandemic response an unprecedented level of collaborations and cooperation and no indication that IP has stood in the way of the pandemic response. **The waiver proponents have found zero credible examples of where IP has actually been an obstacle,** where somebody has tried to block somebody else from developing a COVID vaccine or other COVID countermeasure, right? It’s not there. **Second, the myth of this vast global capacity to manufacture COVID vaccines that somehow exists** **out there is unsubstantiated** and frankly, in my opinion, untrue. But there is no such thing as vast untapped, idle capacity that could be turned around on a dime to start making COVID vaccines within weeks or even months. This capacity needs to be built; it needs to be established. And at a time when time is of the essence to beat this pandemic, starting capacity-building discussions is helpful, but it won’t be the answer to beat this pandemic. It will be the answer if we do everything right to beating the next pandemic. And if we learn any lesson of this, and then I will stop, is that the COVID waiver as well as the situation in which we find ourselves — if anything, it’s a reminder that we definitely have to take global capacity-building more seriously than we did in the past. That is true for the global North, as well as for middle-income countries — all of whom have to dedicate themselves much more determinedly to pandemic preparedness. And there’s a need to invest both in preparedness and in public health systems that hasn’t happened in the wake of past pandemic threats. This is what we will need to do. We will need to reduce export restrictions, and we will need to rededicate ourselves to preparing for the next pandemic. As far as this pandemic goes, **there are 11 vaccines around the world that are already being shot into arms, only four of which come from the global North. How many more vaccines do we want?** I don’t know, maybe 11 is enough if we start making more of them. But there are manufacturers around the world who know how to do this — including in China, including in India, and including in Russia. All developed their homegrown vaccines, apparently without interference by IP rights, right? **So let’s make more of those. I think that’s going to be the more practical and realistic answer to solving the problem**. And we need to lean on governments to stop export controls and to dedicate themselves to more global equity.

## 3

#### Biden PC is key to getting Manchin & Sinema on board – continued negotiations tentatively get their votes – it’s try or die for Tuesday’s vote

Edmondson & Cochrane 10/24 [Catie Edmondson is a reporter in the Washington bureau of The New York Times, covering Congress, Emily Cochrane is a correspondent based in Washington. She has covered Congress since late 2018, focusing on the annual debate over government funding and economic legislation, ranging from emergency pandemic relief to infrastructure, “Biden Meets With Manchin and Schumer as Democrats Race to Finish Social Policy Bill”, 10-24-2021, New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/24/us/politics/biden-manchin-schumer-spending-bill.html]//pranav

WASHINGTON — President Biden huddled with key Democrats on Sunday to iron out crucial spending and tax provisions as they raced to wrap up their expansive social safety net legislation before his appearance at a U.N. climate summit next week. Speaker Nancy Pelosi of California said Democrats were close to completing the bill, displaying confidence that the negotiations over issues like paid leave, tax increases and Medicare benefits that have bedeviled the party for months would soon end. “We have 90 percent of the bill agreed to and written. We just have some of the last decisions to be made,” Ms. Pelosi said on CNN’s “State of the Union,” adding that she hoped to pass an infrastructure bill that had already cleared the Senate and have a deal in hand on the social policy bill by the end of the week. “We’re pretty much there now.” Her comments came as Mr. Biden met with Senators Chuck Schumer of New York, the majority leader, and Joe Manchin III of West Virginia, one of the critical centrist holdouts on the budget bill. The White House called the breakfast at Mr. Biden’s Wilmington home a “productive discussion.” For weeks, intraparty divisions over the scope and size of their marquee domestic policy plan have delayed an agreement on how to trim the initial $3.5 trillion blueprint Democrats passed this year. In order to bypass united Republican opposition and pass the final bill, Democrats are using an arcane budget process known as reconciliation, which shields fiscal legislation from a filibuster but would require every Senate Democrat to unite behind the plan in the evenly divided chamber. The party’s margins in the House are not much more forgiving. Facing opposition over the $3.5 trillion price tag, White House and party leaders are coalescing around a cost of up to $2 trillion over 10 years. They have spent days negotiating primarily with Mr. Manchin and Senator Kyrsten Sinema, Democrat of Arizona and another centrist holdout. House Democratic leaders hope to advance both a compromise reconciliation package and the $1 trillion bipartisan infrastructure package. Liberals have so far balked at voting on the bipartisan deal until the more expansive domestic policy package — which is expected to address climate change, public education and health care — is agreed upon. But Democrats are facing a new sense of urgency to finish the legislation before Mr. Biden’s trip to a major United Nations climate change conference, where he hopes to point to the bill as proof that the United States is serious about leading the effort to fight global warming. “The president looked us in the eye, and he said: ‘I need this before I go and represent the United States in Glasgow. American prestige is on the line,’” Representative Ro Khanna, a California Democrat who met with Mr. Biden last week at the White House, said on “Fox News Sunday.” Democrats are also increasingly eager to deliver the bipartisan legislation to Mr. Biden’s desk before elections for governor in Virginia and New Jersey on Nov. 2, to show voters the party is making good on its promise to deliver sweeping social change. And a number of transportation programs will lapse at the end of the month without congressional action on either a stopgap extension or passage of the infrastructure bill, leading to possible furloughs.

#### Big Pharma hates the plan – empirics – err neg our ev literally cites their press releases

PhRMA ’21 [The Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA) represents the country’s leading innovative biopharmaceutical research companies, which are devoted to discovering and developing medicines that enable patients to live longer, healthier and more productive lives. Since 2000, PhRMA member companies have invested nearly $1 trillion in the search for new treatments and cures, including an estimated $83 billion in 2019 alone, “PhRMA Statement on WTO TRIPS Intellectual Property Waiver”, 05-05-2021, https://www.phrma.org/coronavirus/phrma-statement-on-wto-trips-intellectual-property-waiver]//pranav

WASHINGTON, D.C. (May 5, 2021) – Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA) president and CEO Stephen J. Ubl made the following statement after the United States Trade Representative expressed support for a proposal to waive patent protections for COVID-19 medicines: “In the midst of a deadly pandemic, the Biden Administration has taken an unprecedented step that will undermine our global response to the pandemic and compromise safety. This decision will sow confusion between public and private partners, further weaken already strained supply chains and foster the proliferation of counterfeit vaccines. “This change in longstanding American policy will not save lives. It also flies in the face of President Biden’s stated policy of building up American infrastructure and creating jobs by handing over American innovations to countries looking to undermine our leadership in biomedical discovery. This decision does nothing to address the real challenges to getting more shots in arms, including last-mile distribution and limited availability of raw materials. These are the real challenges we face that this empty promise ignores. “In the past few days alone, we’ve seen more American vaccine exports, increased production targets from manufacturers, new commitments to COVAX and unprecedented aid for India during its devastating COVID-19 surge. Biopharmaceutical manufacturers are fully committed to providing global access to COVID-19 vaccines, and they are collaborating at a scale that was previously unimaginable, including more than 200 manufacturing and other partnerships to date. The biopharmaceutical industry shares the goal to get as many people vaccinated as quickly as possible, and we hope we can all re-focus on that shared objective.”

#### They lash out against infra and use COVID clout to kill it – they have public support, and a win now postpones reform indefinitely which turns case

Fuchs et al. 09/02 [Hailey Fuchsattended Yale University and was an inaugural Bradlee Fellow for The Washington Post, where she reported on national politics**,** Alice Ollstein is a health care reporter for POLITICO Pro, covering the Capitol Hill beat. Prior to joining POLITICO, she covered federal policy and politics for Talking Points Memo, Megan Wilson is a health care and influence reporter at POLITICO, “Drug industry banks on its Covid clout to halt Dems’ push on prices”, 09-02-2021, https://www.politico.com/news/2021/09/02/drug-prices-democrats-lobbying-508127]//pranav

As Democrats prepare a massive overhaul of prescription drug policy, major pharmaceutical companies are mounting a lobbying campaign against it, arguing that the effort could undermine a Covid fight likely to last far longer than originally expected. In meetings with lawmakers, lobbyists for the pharmaceutical industry have issued warnings about the reconciliation package now moving through both chambers of Congress that is set to include language allowing Medicare to negotiate the price of some drugs, which could generate billions of dollars in savings. In those conversations, K Street insiders say, lobbyists have explicitly mentioned that the fight against the coronavirus will almost certainly extend beyond the current surge of the Delta variant. And they’re arguing that now isn’t the time to hit the industry with new regulations or taxes, particularly in light of its successful efforts to swiftly develop vaccines for the virus. “For years, politicians have been saying that the federal government can interfere in the price of medicines and patients won’t suffer any harm,” said Brian Newell, a spokesperson for the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, or PhRMA, in a statement. “But in countries where this already happens, people experience fewer choices and less access to prescription medicines. Patients know if something sounds too good to be true, then it usually is.” The escalating warnings from the pharmaceutical industry are part of what is expected to be one of the more dramatic and expensive lobbying fights in recent memory, and a heightened repeat of the industry’s pushback to actions by former President Donald Trump to target drug prices. The proposal now under consideration in Democrats’ reconciliation package could save the federal government hundreds of billions of dollars by leveraging its ability to purchase prescription drugs, according to a report from the Congressional Budget Office. Without those funds, Democrats won’t be able to pay for the rest of the health care agenda they’ve promised to voters, including expansions of Medicare, Medicaid and Obamacare. But the plan has political power as more than a revenue raiser. Party leaders — from President Joe Biden to Senate Budget Chair Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) — are touting it as one of the most important components of the $3.5 trillion package, with the potential to lower out-of-pocket health spending for tens if not hundreds of millions of people. Outside advocates have also zeroed in on it as the most consequential policy fight on the horizon. “This is the best chance that we have seen in a couple of decades to enact meaningful reforms to drug pricing policy in the United States that will lower the prices of prescription drugs, and it’s very clear that the drug companies are going all out to stop it,” said David Mitchell, founder of Patients for Affordable Drugs. “This is Armageddon for pharma.” Progressive Democrats and their outside allies believe they’re closer than they’ve been in decades to imposing some price controls, and worry that failure to do so this year will delay progress indefinitely given the possibility of the party losing one or more chambers of Congress in the 2022 midterms. In April, the House passed a fairly aggressive version — H.R. 3 (117) — though a handful of moderate Democrats friendly to the industry have threatened to block it when it comes back to the floor for a vote later this fall. Leadership has largely shrugged off this threat, banking on the fact that the most vulnerable frontline Democrats are vocally in favor of the policy, while most of the dissenters sit in safe blue districts. The Senate is designing its own version, outlined by Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) in June, as a middle ground between HR3 and the more narrow, bipartisan bill he and Sen. Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa) put forward last Congress. A senior Senate Democratic aide confirmed to POLITICO that the bill is nearly complete and that they’re in the process of shopping it around to undecided senators to make sure it has enough support to move forward in the 50-50 upper chamber. “It makes sense to get buy-in before releasing it rather than releasing it with fingers crossed and then tweaking it once members complain,” the aide said. But the reform push is coming at a time when the pharmaceutical industry is working hand-in-hand with government officials to combat the pandemic and enjoying a boost in public opinion as a result, even as drug costs continue to rise. The companies claim that fundamental changes to their bottom line — in addition to the Medicare provision, the reconciliation bill will likely raise corporate tax rate significantly, as high as 28 percent (a jump of 7 percentage points) — will threaten its current investments in research and development at a historically critical juncture. With the final draft of the bill expected in the coming weeks, the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, the lobbying arm of the pharmaceutical industry, is taking its case public. The group has recently spent at least seven figures on ads pressuring Congress not to change Medicare drug policy.

#### Specifically, they flip Sinema – she’s in their pocket

Perez & Sirota 10/08 [Andrew Perez - Senior editor and reporter at The Daily Poster covering money and influence, David Sirota - Journalist. Denverite. Founder of The Daily Poster. Editor at Large of Jacobin. Columnist at The Guardian, ““They Pick The One””, https://www.dailyposter.com/they-pick-the-one/]//pranav

“The pharmaceutical lobby is very savvy,” Democratic Rep. Ro Khanna, D-Calif., said earlier this week during a Daily Poster live chat. “They pick the one or two people they need to block things, on the relevant committees or at the relevant time." “It may differ from congress to congress,” explained Khanna, who is a member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. “We try to get 90-95 percent [of the caucus]. They are focused not on 90 percent, but the blockers.” In the current Congress, Big Pharma appears to have zeroed in on Sen. Kyrsten Sinema, D-Ariz., as one of their lead obstructionists to help kill or gut Democrats’ drug pricing plan. In the 2020 election cycle, pharmaceutical political action committees suddenly funneled more money to her than they did the whole six years she served in the U.S. House. Pharmaceutical companies can charge up to four times as much in the United States for name-brand pharmaceuticals than in other countries, in part because Congress barred Medicare from using its bulk purchasing power to negotiate lower drug prices. President Joe Biden and most Democrats support lifting that prohibition in their reconciliation legislation, a move that would save hundreds of billions of dollars — but Sinema has emerged as the party’s most prominent opponent to the plan. Her heel turn on drug pricing is a dramatic shift. A one-time progressive activist, Sinema campaigned on lowering drug prices in her 2018 Senate race, and she was still calling on Congress to address rising drug costs as recently as last year, boasting on her Senate website that she was fighting to “ensure life-saving drugs” would be more affordable. But it’s clear now the pharmaceutical industry has been courting Sinema for some time. Indeed, in March 2021, as pharmaceutical PAC money was flooding into her campaign coffers, drug lobbyists were already bragging to Beltway reporters that they may have found their lead blocker in Sinema.

#### Infra’s k2 stopping existential climate change – warming is incremental and every change in temperature is vital

Higgins 8/16 [Trevor, Senior Director, Domestic Climate and Energy, “Budget Reconciliation Is the Key to Stopping Climate Change”, 08-16-2021, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2021/08/16/502681/budget-reconciliation-key-stopping-climate-change/]//pranav

The United States is suffering acutely from the chaotic changes in climate that scientists now directly attribute to the burning of fossil fuels and other human activity. The drought, fires, extreme heat, and floods that have already killed hundreds this summer across the continent and around the world are a tragedy—and a warning of worsening instability yet to come. However, this week, the Senate initiated an extraordinary legislative response that would set the world on a different path. Enacting the full scope of President Joe Biden’s Build Back Better agenda would put the American economy to work leading a global transition to clean energy and stabilizing the climate. A look at what’s coming next through the budget reconciliation process reveals a ray of hope that is easy to miss amid the fitful negotiations of recent months: At long last, Congress is on the verge of major legislation that would build a more equitable, just, and inclusive clean energy economy. This is our shot to stop climate change. Building a clean energy future must start now Until the global economy stops polluting the air and instead starts to draw down the emissions of years past, the world will continue to heat up, blundering past perilous tipping points that threaten irreversible and catastrophic consequences. Stemming the extent of warming at 1.5 degrees Celsius rather 2 degrees or worse will reduce the risk of crossing such tipping points or otherwise exceeding the adaptive capacity of human society. Every degree matters. Stabilizing global warming at 1.5 degrees Celsius starts with cutting annual greenhouse gas emissions in the United States to half of peak levels by 2030. This isn’t about temporary offsets or incremental gains in efficiency—it’s about the rapid adoption of scalable solutions that will work throughout the world to eliminate global net emissions by 2050 and sustain net-negative emissions thereafter. Building this better future will tackle climate change, deliver on environmental justice, and create good jobs. It will give us a shot to stop the planet from continuously warming. It will alleviate the concentrated burdens of fossil fuel pollution, which are concentrated in systemically disadvantaged, often majority Black and brown communities. It will empower American workers to compete in the global clean energy economy of the 21st century. There is no time to lose in the work of building a clean energy future.

#### Have a high threshold for climate skep—their ev is silly propaganda

Santos and Feygina 17 [Jessica M. Santos SCHOOL OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR, MI 48109 & CLIMATE CENTRAL, PRINCETON, NJ. Irina Feygina CLIMATE CENTRAL, PRINCETON, NJ]. “Responding to Climate Change Skepticism and the Ideological Divide.” Michigan Journal of Sustainability 5, no. 1 (2017). http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/mjs.12333712.0005.102.~Anop

How can we make sense of skepticism in response to an urgent threat that may destroy civilization as we know it? Central to understanding climate skepticism is the psychological process of motivated reasoning—the unconscious process of making conclusions, developing preferences, or making decisions in ways that are influenced by, and often aim to align with, an individual’s needs, goals, beliefs, and desires (Kunda 1990). Motivated reasoning affects information processing and can result in ignoring, discounting, misunderstanding, or biasing information that conflicts with existing beliefs and attitudes, or to strengthening these despite the inconsistent nature of the information (Redlawsk 2002). Motivated reasoning serves to protect and maintain an individual’s beliefs, attitudes, worldviews, and perception of self (i.e. Dunning 1999; Lewandowsky and Oberauer 2016; Taber and Lodge 2006). In the domain of political decision-making, motivated reasoning is at play when voters support a policy if it is endorsed by their political party (Peterson et al. 2013), even if they would otherwise oppose it (Bolsen, Druckman, and Cook 2014). Similarly, presenting voters with negative information about their preferred candidate gives rise to stronger, rather than weaker, support (Redlawsk 2002). Individuals of both political parties are affected by motivated reasoning (e.g. Kahan 2013; Leeper and Slothuus 2014; Taber and Lodge 2006). Motivated reasoning is also at play in how people process and respond to scientific information about climate change. Conservative individuals who follow science news are less likely than their liberal counterparts to support climate change mitigation policy (Hart, Nisbet, and Myers 2015), while individuals who are motivated to reject scientific results due to partisanship are more likely to do so if they are educated and scientifically literate (Lewandowsky and Oberauer 2016). These findings suggest that presenting people with information about climate change are by no means sufficient to convince them of its reality, and that these effects are not ameliorated, but rather exacerbated, by education. Motivated reasoning underlies many mechanisms that contribute to climate change skepticism, discussed next.e

## 4

#### Terrorists can’t use CRISPR for bioterror yet, but the 1AC’s further democratization of the tech erases any barriers.

Pavel & Venkatram 9/7 [Barry Pavel is the senior vice president and director of the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security at the Atlantic Council. Prior to joining the Atlantic Council, Barry Pavel was a career member of the Senior Executive Service in the Officer of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy for almost eighteen years. From October 2008 to July 2010, he served as the special assistant to the President and senior director for defense policy and strategy on the National Security Council (NSC) staff, serving both President George W. Bush and President Barack Obama. Prior to this, Pavel was the chief of staff and principal deputy assistant secretary of defense for special operations/low-intensity conflict and interdependent capabilities. From October 1993 to November 2006, Pavel also led or contributed to a broad range of defense strategy and planning initiatives for both the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations. In this capacity, Pavel supported post-9/11 deterrence policy (including deterrence of terrorist networks and regional nuclear powers); strategies for reducing ungoverned areas; and a long-range planning construct that accounts for trends and “strategic shocks” that could significantly change Department of Defense’s role in national security, Vikram Venkatram is a Young Global Professional in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security, Forward Defense at the Atlantic Council. He is a recent graduate of Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service, where he studied Science, Technology, and International Affairs with a minor in Biology. He is also currently a second-year graduate student in Georgetown’s Security Studies Program. Originally from San Jose, California, his main interests lie in biosecurity issues, ranging from pandemic preparedness to emerging biotechnology to environmental security to bioethics, “Facing the future of bioterrorism”, 09-07-2021, https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/commentary/article/facing-the-future-of-bioterrorism/]//pranav

Biotechnology has developed at an astounding rate over the first twenty years of the twenty-first century. Emerging biotechnological tools have become cheaper and more accessible than ever before, and less expertise is necessary to use those tools effectively. Amateur biologists can now accomplish feats that would have been impossible until recently for even the foremost experts in top-of-the-line laboratories. The iGEM competition is a great example of this phenomenon in practice: a synthetic biology competition in which amateur scientists compete with one another to build biological systems and operate them within living cells. Similarly, CRISPR, a scientific technique that enables the manipulation of DNA and genetic engineering, can be used in the high-school classroom as an illustrative practical example of biology. There exists a new and growing community of “biohackers” who use novel biotechnology tools to modify their own bodies in a variety of ways. As biotechnologist Drew Endy at Stanford University put it, many years ago hackers would hack computer code, but now they are hacking the code for life.1 Thus, biotechnology capabilities are becoming democratized. In general, this evolution of biotechnology will bring with it an amazing array of changes to our societies, our economies, and our security. The growing biotech revolution will have as great an impact on our way of life as the communications and information revolution. Chronic diseases will be mitigated, human life spans will be extended, and the global economy will be increasingly driven by biological inventions and processes. A new understanding of epigenetics could usher in an era of highly personalized medicine, and gene drives could wipe mosquito-borne diseases like malaria from the planet. One day, engineered living materials, built through synthetic biology, might grow to suit specific architectural needs and heal when faced with wear and tear. Neuroenhancement technology could optimize human performance: increasing learning speed, combatting neurological diseases, or even assisting soldiers by boosting their awareness and decision-making on the battleground. A new generation of scientists will build a suite of as-yet-undiscovered technologies, transforming the world in radical ways. However, greater access to cheap but powerful biotechnology tools—and a reduced need for expertise in operating those tools—also is making it easier for malicious actors to utilize that technology for ill. Terrorist groups could use synthetic biology to craft bioweapons, using data to manufacture dangerous pathogens or modifying easily accessible pathogens to make them more virulent. At present, there are still some barriers to entry that prevent such actors from operating with free reign, as widespread access to certain pathogens, tools, and data is still limited. But these barriers will only continue to recede over the next decade. In evaluating the future of terrorism and counterterrorism, one must consider: How should the United States and its allies prepare to face the growing threat of bioterrorism?

#### Terrorism causes global nuclear war—collapses internal AND external stability

Arguello and Buis, 18 – \*Irma, Founder and Chair of the NPSGlobal Foundation (Non-proliferation for Global Security), degree in Phyisics Science from the University of Buenos Aires, Master degree in Business Administration from IDEA/Wharton School, Defense and Security studies (Master level) at the Escuela de Defensa Nacional, Argentina; \*\*Emiliano, lawyer and associate professor of public international law, international humanitarian law, international law of disarmament, and the origins of international law in antiquity (Irma Arguello & Emiliano J. Buis, “The global impacts of a terrorist nuclear attack: What would happen? What should we do?,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 2018, https://doi.org/10.1080/00963402.2018.1436812)

But the consequences would go far beyond the effects in the target country, however, and promptly propagate worldwide. Global and national security, economy and finance, international governance and its framework, national political systems, and the behavior of governments and individuals would all be put under severe trial. The severity of the effects at a national level, however, would depend on the countries’ level of development, geopolitical location, and resilience. Global security and regional/national defense schemes would be strongly affected. An increase in global distrust would spark rising tensions among countries and blocs, that could even lead to the brink of nuclear weapons use by states (if, for instance, a sponsor country is identified). The consequences of such a shocking scenario would include a decrease in states’ self-control, an escalation of present conflicts and the emergence of new ones, accompanied by an increase in military unilateralism and military expenditures. Regarding the economic and financial impacts, a severe global economic depression would rise from the attack, likely lasting for years. Its duration would be strongly dependent on the course of the crisis. The main results of such a crisis would include a 2 percent fall of growth in global Gross Domestic Product, and a 4 percent decline of international trade in the two years following the attack (cf. Figure 3). In the case of developing and less-developed countries, the economic impacts would also include a shortage of high-technology products such as medicines, as well as a fall in foreign direct investment and a severe decline of international humanitarian aid toward low-income countries. We expect an increase of unemployment and poverty in all countries. Global poverty would raise about 4 percent after the attack, which implies that at least 30 million more people would be living in extreme poverty, in addition to the current estimated 767 million. In the area of international relations, we would expect a breakdown of key doctrines involving politics, security, and relations among states. These international tensions could lead to a collapse of the nuclear order as we know it today, with a consequent setback of nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation commitments. In other words, the whole system based on the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty would be put under severe trial. After the attack, there would be a reassessment of existing security doctrines, and a deep review of concepts such as nuclear deterrence, no-firstuse, proportionality, and negative security assurances. Finally, the behavior of governments and individuals would also change radically. Internal chaos fueled by the media and social networks would threaten governance at all levels, with greater impact on those countries with weak institutional frameworks. Social turbulence would emerge in most countries, with consequent attempts by governments to impose restrictions on personal freedoms to preserve order – possibly by declaring a state of siege or state of emergency – and legislation would surely become tougher on human rights. There would also be a significant increase in social fragmentation – with a deepening of antagonistic views, mistrust, and intolerance, both within countries and towards others – and a resurgence of large-scale social movements fostered by ideological interests and easily mobilized through social media.

#### No shady “no links” – CRISPR is medicine

He et al. ’20 [Yixuan Xie, Yanfang Yang, Yu He, Xixi Wang, Shufang Liang - State Key Laboratory of Biotherapy and Cancer Center, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, and Collaborative Innovation Center for Biotherapy, Chengdu, China, Peng Zhang - Department of Urinary Surgery, West China Hospital, West China Medical School, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, Haocheng Li - Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada, “Synthetic Biology Speeds Up Drug Target Discovery”, 02-26-2020, [https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphar.2020.00119/full]//pranav](https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphar.2020.00119/full%5d//pranav)

Molecular biology serves as a powerful tool to turn genes on and off. The principle difference between molecular biology and synthetic biology is that synthetic biology assembles parts from molecular biology (Macdonald and Deans, 2016). As the most well-known system of synthetic biology, CRISPR-Cas9 system is a convenient tool for site-directed mutation and identification of gene function. Cas9 is a member of Cas endonucleases. Among these endonucleases, the most famous and well-studied are Cas9, Cas12a (previously known as Cpf1), Cas13a, and Cas13b (Zetsche et al., 2015). Both Cas9 and Cas12a are targeting DNA, while Cas13a and Cas13b are targeting RNA.

## Case

### Framework

#### Reducing existential risks is the top priority in any coherent moral theory

Pummer 15 (Theron, Philosophy @St. Andrews http://blog.practicalethics.ox.ac.uk/2015/05/moral-agreement-on-saving-the-world/)

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

AT: Conetta

1] Make them indict our internal links---their interp justifies arbitrarily lowering the risk of dropped args, which breaks the game and collapses into endless judge intervention based on how likely you think the DA is

2] goes both ways – solvency internal links are suspect – the plan can’t make COVID disappear

3] is about conflict scenarios which is distinct from both disad impacts

AT: group them - Kessler & Karnofsky

1] large scale impacts turn suffering – disproportionately effect those at the margins – proven w warming & rising coastlines which effects more low-income people

2] our impacts are probable – they have to win impact defense AND internal link defense to disprove them

3] this logic is the same logic that’s allowed warming to get to its current state – warming is real and happening nows

AT: Winter & Leighton

#### 1---Tautological---devolves into consequentialism---either their maxims are created to minimize harm, which means they’re utilitarian consequentialist, or they’re inflexible in cases of moral atrocity worse than utilitarianism because they requires saving some people over others

#### 2---Not our util---utilitarian framework wouldn’t justify atrocities like slavery because the magnitude of the harm to a smaller group still outweighs

AT: Simpson

#### Warming causes extinction & turns every impact – no adaptation & each degree is worse – irreversible within a decade – o/w their ev on recency & specificity

Krosofsky ’21 [Andrew, Green Matters Journalist, “How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction”, Green Matters, 03-11-2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction]//pranav

Eventually, yes. Global warming will invariably result in the mass extinction of millions of different species, humankind included. In fact, the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet. Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won’t be able to handle long-term. Extreme weather patterns are shifting climates across the globe, eliminating habitats and altering the landscape. As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced. Then, of course, there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions. The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak. The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming. Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to ocean acidification. This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia’s Great Barrier Reef, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that more than 30 percent of Earth’s plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050. By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent. We won’t try and sugarcoat things, humanity’s own prospects aren’t looking that great either. According to The Conversation, our species has just under a decade left to get our CO₂ emissions under control. If we don’t cut those emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to potentially catastrophic levels. It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense. The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, but it will mean less food, less water, and increased hardship across the world — especially in low-income areas and developing countries. This increase will also mean more pandemics, devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires.

### Solvency

The gostin ev – cp avoids bc it increases production too & lets other countries manufacture

The merelli ev –

1] proves politics link – pharma hates the plan & perceives it negative

2] they can’t solve ALL medical inequality – ie – doctors viewing black people’s pain levels differently – only grant them access to the total amount of inequality they solve.

Ought plan flaw – a) presumption b) textual education

### Advantage

Fink is about pre-existing healthy inequality that has influenced COVID reaction – they can’t solve that.

#### Also says lack of testing & no clear picture of spread causes the impact. Also advocates for the CP – Westwood inserts blue

**1AC Fink 21** (Fink 7-30-21 (Jenni, <https://www.newsweek.com/who-warns-world-blind-understanding-covid-spread-hurting-ability-end-pandemic-1614722>)

A lack of testing for COVID-19 in parts of the world is preventing countries from having a clear picture of how the virus is spreading and therefore hurting the world's chances at **fighting the virus and ending the pandemic**, according to the World Health Organization. **Health inequities** throughout the world have plagued the global response to COVID-19 from the outset and WHO has pushed higher income countries to help lower income countries in the interest of ending the pandemic. Along with restricted access to vaccines, lower income countries have struggled to have sufficient testing, meaning the virus is likely going undetected in certain areas, further enabling its ability to spread. Low testing rates is "leaving the world blind to understanding where the disease is and how it's changing," Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, director general of the WHO said on Friday during a press briefing. Without improving global testing rates, Ghebreyesus said the world can't "fight the disease" or mitigate the risk it poses to people around the globe. who blind covid spread cases On Friday, the World Health Organization warned the world is "blind" to how COVID-19 is spreading because of a lack of testing in certain places. W,HO Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus attends a daily press briefing on the new coronavirus dubbed COVID-19, at the WHO headquaters on March 2, 2020, in Geneva. FABRICE COFFRINI//AFP/GETTY IMAGES NEWSWEEK NEWSLETTER SIGN-UP > One of Ghebreyesus' biggest frustrations with the pandemic response is the failure to **evenly distribute the vaccine** around the world. In some countries, like the United States and other higher-income nations, significant portions of the population have been vaccinated. While those large vaccinated populations help reduce the spread of the virus in some areas, other countries, especially those in Africa, haven't been able to vaccinate even 10 percent of their population. This puts the entire world at risk because when the virus is able to spread throughout communities it **has the ability to mutate**, thereby increasing the possibility that a mutation could **evade the vaccines**. It's a scenario public health officials have been warning about for months and Ghebreyesus said on Friday that "hard won **gains are in jeopardy**" or have already been lost because the virus has been able to spread. Nearly 30 countries have high or rising oxygen needs and the shortage of life-saving oxygen could lead to increased deaths. More than 196 million cases of COVID-19 have been reported around the world, according to a Johns Hopkins University tracker, and more than 4.2 million people have died. Ghebreyesus suspected the number of cases would top 200 million within the next two weeks and warned that health systems in many countries **are being overwhelmed.** Preventing hospitals from exceeding capacity was a massive concern when the pandemic first broke out and a year later, parts of the U.S. are having their health systems strained as the more transmissible Delta variant spreads. On Thursday, Arkansas Governor Asa Hutchinson declared a public health emergency that allows the state to bring in health care workers from outside Arkansas and makes it easier for retired health care workers and medical students to become licensed. The goal is to help alleviate stress on health care systems and Hutchinson said they've had people waiting in ambulances because there wasn't an open spot in a hospital. That strain will only become more exacerbated if a mutation occurs that evades the vaccine, as inoculations have proven effective at helping to keep people out of the hospital. Ghebreyesus warned that more variants will emerge if global access to vaccines and testing doesn't improve. "The pandemic will end when the world chooses to end it. It is in our hands. We have all the tools we need. We can prevent this disease. We can test for it and we can treat it," Ghebreyesus said.

#### They’ve got mutations wrong - Vaccines don’t solve & could drive virus evolution which turns case – adaptation

Gorman & Zimmer ’20 [James Gorman is a science writer at large for The New York Times and the author of books on hypochondria, penguins, dinosaurs and the ocean around Antarctica, Carl Zimmer writes the “Matter” column for The New York Times, “The Virus Won’t Stop Evolving When the Vaccine Arrives”, 11-27-2020, New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/27/science/covid-vaccine-virus-resistance.html]//pranav

Lederberg advised vigilance: “We have no guarantee that the natural evolutionary competition of viruses with the human species will always find ourselves the winner.” With the emergence of what seem so far to be safe and effective vaccine candidates, it appears that humanity may be the winner again this time around, albeit with a dreadful loss of life. But vaccines won’t put an end to the evolution of this coronavirus, as David A. Kennedy and Andrew F. Read of The Pennsylvania State University, specialists in viral resistance to vaccines, wrote in PLoS Biology recently. Instead, they could even drive new evolutionary change. There is always the chance, though small, the authors write, that the virus could evolve resistance to a vaccine, what researchers call “viral escape.” They urge monitoring of vaccine effects and viral response, just in case. “Nothing that we’re saying is suggesting that we slow down development of vaccines,” Dr. Kennedy said. An effective vaccine is of utmost importance, he said, “But let’s make sure that it stays efficacious.” Vaccine makers could use the results of nasal swabs taken from volunteers during trials to look for any genetic changes in the virus. Test results need not stop or slow down vaccine rollout, but if recipients of the vaccine had changes in the virus that those who received the placebo did not, that would indicate “the potential for resistance

They can’t guarantee people actually take the vaccine – US vaccine skep proves access doesn’t= vaccinated people.

#### Sekala 1 is about other IP agreements the plan can’t get rid of – Westwood inserts Blue

1AC Seklala et al 21 – Sharifah Sekalala, Warwick Law School, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK; Lisa Forman, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; Timothy Hodgson, International Commission of Jurists, Johannesburg, South Africa,;Moses Mulumba, Center for Health, Human Rights and Development, Kampala, Uganda; Hadijah Namyalo-Ganafa, School of Law, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda; Benjamin Mason Meier, Department of Public Policy, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA (“Decolonising human rights: how intellectual property laws result in unequal access to the COVID-19 vaccine,” 2021, pg. 2-4) julian

The development and dissemination of COVID-19 vaccines has highlighted how the international legal system pertaining to global health is driving global health inequalities instead of alleviating them. As a result, in part, of neocolonial ‘development’ models that promote inequitable IP laws, most of the vaccine supply has been manufactured in the Global North and purchased by governments in those countries to be stockpiled for their own populations—a practice sometimes described as ‘vaccine hoarding’ or ‘vaccine nationalism’.19 20

Even where countries in the Global South have produced vaccines themselves in significant quantities, they have sometimes been guilty of perpetuating inequity of other Global South countries through vaccine nationalism and vaccine diplomacy, in which vaccines are offered to poorer countries in order to achieve geopolitical objectives.21 22 A decolonised approach to global health enables us to conceptualise this behaviour as a reproduction of a neocolonial system which pits some formerly colonised countries against others.23 24 This has meant that some countries in the Global South also benefit from this uneven system, and they too contribute to the exploitation of poorer countries in the Global South.21

Although the WHO cocreated the COVAX Facility, a donor-funded mechanism that seeks to pool procurement to enhance access to vaccines for LMICs, the charitable funding scheme is facing a serious shortfall in meeting global needs. The WHO has estimated that most people in LMICs will not be vaccinated until the end of 2023,25 and even this estimate may be optimistic, given the delays in initial distributions through COVAX.26

This prompts the obvious question: How is it that existing legal mechanisms, or at least the prevailing interpretations and understandings of them, have permitted and even enabled this inequity? International IP law embedded in international trade agreements allows pharmaceutical companies time-limited rights to prevent others from making, using or selling their patented invention without permission. Under the 1995 Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), which was included in the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiation, pharmaceutical companies have at least 20 years from filing a patent to profit from their investments in developing, testing and upscaling pharmaceutical products throughout the world.27 This protection is given to pharmaceutical companies to incentivise them to engage in greater research and development for new drugs. However, there is evidence that challenges previous assumptions about the linkages between Research and Development spending and innovation for essential medicines.28 The current COVID-19 crisis has brought this into sharp focus, with projections that the global public sector had spent at least €93 billion on the development of COVID-19 vaccines and therapeutics—€85.6 billion of this on vaccines.29

Global IP rights, whether adopted in accordance with TRIPS, or subsequent bilateral and multilateral agreements, are part of a wider legal system which facilitates global neocolonialism. For instance, powerful actors such as the European Union (EU) and the USA have included TRIPS-plus provisions in bilateral and multilateral agreements. These agreements often force countries of the Global South to concede to more stringent patent protections in order to gain trade advantages and also to escape trade sanctions.30

In so doing, IP law commodifies medicines that are essential to human survival and well-being, and sacrifices the lives and health of the poor and otherwise marginalised on the altar of corporate profitability.31 Common interpretations and understandings of the international IP system are that healthcare goods and services derive their value from their tradability.14 (‘We use the term “public good” as it is used in global health to mean a good that should be available universally because of its critical importance to health, and not as the term is used in economics to mean a good that is both non-excludable and non-rivalrous.’)14 32 However, many, including critical Global South scholars, have questioned the prioritisation of property rights (including IP rights) over other rights (especially the rights to health, life and equal benefit from scientific progress) in a manner that is inconsistent with international human rights law.31

Many low-income countries have long been active in resisting the IP system as an unjust extension of a colonial trade system. At the height of the HIV pandemic, in which millions of people in the Global South were denied lifesaving medicines, civil society treatment access campaigns galvanised states within the World Trade Organization (WTO) into agreeing to the Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health.33 This WTO Declaration recognises human rights and allows states to use all of the ‘flexibilities’ within the TRIPS regime to protect public health, acknowledging the need for access to medicines in a public health emergency.34 However, this international consensus on IP has always been strongly contested by pharmaceutical companies and their host governments, predominantly in the Global North.

This remarkably strong resistance to employing TRIPS flexibilities has continued in the current COVID-19 crisis, as the attempts of countries largely from the Global South to try to obtain a TRIPS waiver to increase their supply of vaccines for COVID-19 have been unsuccessful. Although the USA has recently supported a watered-down version of a TRIPS waiver, it remains far from certain whether other states in the Global North will support this prioritisation of health over IP rights, or whether this would be sufficient, as we discuss in the section on flexibilities below.

Rather than allowing for equitable vaccine access as a human right for all people everywhere, states have instead turned to a charitable donation and market purchase scheme through the COVAX initiative. This type of model, which focuses on charity and not rights, is consistent with exactly the kind of understandings of human rights and public health that are in need of decolonisation. While there have been public consensus statements issued by the Human Rights Council, in which states have agreed that all states have the right to access vaccines and the right to use TRIPS flexibilities, this statement reflects a disappointing failure to acknowledge any corresponding state obligations to employ such flexibilities.35 This has allowed countries from the Global North, and their few Global South allies, to agree to this statement and support the right to vaccine access rhetorically, and in principle within the Human Rights Council, while resisting any calls for a TRIPS waiver within the WTO, and thus consolidating a denial of their obligations to employ TRIPS flexibilities.

They can’t solve Seklala 2 – they just mandate no IP, but their ev says GOVERNMENTS are charging for the vaccine – NOT companies – their ev doesn’t even mention the word IP or patents

Sell gets it wrong – COVID doesn’t cause that – it just revealed it which means the plan can’t solve – it’s part of a broader system of capitalism that they don’t eliminate

The HRW ev lists only 5 countries with capabilities – they have not won why that’s enough to resolve GLOBAL vaccine imperialism especially given that all of those countries are relatively rich.

**Multiple alt causes to high drug prices and limited access**

**Kilberg et al 16 (William J. Kilberg is the most senior partner in the Labor and Employment Law Practice Group at Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP. He has served on the firm’s Executive Committee, five-member Management Committee, and as Partner-in-Charge of the Washington office. He has argued many significant matters before eight United States Courts of Appeals and the United States Supreme Court., James A. Paretti, Jr. is an experienced management-side employment and labor relations attorney with in-depth political and policy knowledge of labor, pension, healthcare and employment law, regulations and legislation. Jim is well versed in all aspects of legislative and political processes with demonstrated knowledge in the substance of federal labor and employment policy. He has over two decades of experience working with federal legislators and policymakers, including former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Chairmen of the U.S. House Committee on Education and the Workforce, and senior level administration officials., Marisa Maleck focuses on litigation, regulatory matters and public policy, with a focus on consumer products. As a former senior counsel at a bio-tech company and in private practice, Marisa has substantial experience with and is skilled in providing creative solutions in the face of uncertainty. Marisa represents clients in a variety of matters with a focus on FDA-regulated products like food, beverages, pharmaceuticals, medical devices, wellness products, cosmetics, tobacco and cannabis. As a former senior counsel at an FDA-regulated biotech company and as a former partner in King & Spalding’s Litigation and Global Disputes practice group, she handled hundreds of suits in a multi-district litigation, multiple agency inquiries, an FTC lawsuit and 10+ state Attorney Generals actions. ), “The United Nations' Misguided Approach to Healthcare Access”, 9-6-16, The Federalist Society,** [**https://fedsoc.org/commentary/fedsoc-blog/the-united-nations-misguided-approach-to-healthcare-access**](https://fedsoc.org/commentary/fedsoc-blog/the-united-nations-misguided-approach-to-healthcare-access) **NT**

The Panel Is Poised To Ignore Real Access Problems The Panel’s misguided focus on patents has led the U.S. State Department to encourage the Panel to abandon its “narrow mandate” and instead focus on actual obstacles that stand in the way of persons obtaining life-saving drugs. Echoing the WHO, the State Department has pointed to four main reasons that the developing world lacks access to healthcare: (1) an inability to select and use medicines rationally; (2) unaffordable drug prices; (3) unreliable health and supply systems; and (4) inadequate financing. **None of these barriers are directly related to patents**. First, irrational drug use is a serious barrier to access. The WHO defines “irrational use” as any use that is not “appropriate to [patients’] clinical needs, in doses that meet their own individual requirements, for an adequate period of time, and at the lowest cost to them and their community.” Two recent studies conducted in Africa illustrate this problem. One study conducted at Kapiri Mposhi District Hospital in Central province, Zambia found a high prevalence of irrational drug use. Fifty percent of 680 patient records surveyed showed some form of inappropriate drug use. And a study in Sudan found that 73% of participants reported to have acquired and used medication without a prescription at least a month prior to the study. Second, there is no doubt that affordability is a barrier to access. But patent protections are not to blame. In fact, patents do not protect the vast majority of essential medicines, which the WHO defines as “those drugs that satisfy the health care needs of the majority of the population.” 350 of these 375 “essential medicines” are available in generic versions and are thus sold at a much lower price point. Moreover, data shows that patent-holding companies do not frequently make use of patent laws in developing countries, even where they could. Moreover, **patent rights do not explain the high cost of drugs in the developing world.** The WHO itself points out that **taxes, tariffs** and other government policies play a significant role in keeping drug prices high in emerging markets. And, in fact, reports have concluded that excessive tariffs and taxes on imported medicines **may inflate the cost of medicines by up to one-third.** When combined with taxes on medicines, government-imposed levies account for an additional 55% in India; 40% in Sierra Leone; 34% in Nigeria; and 29% in Bangladesh. In any event, contrary to the Panel’s suggestion, patent protections ultimately help keep the costs of drugs low. To be sure, patented drug prices will often decline only after a patent expires. But the decline in price after patent expiration is not evidence that the drug manufacturer charged too much for the product. To the contrary, the decline in price of a formerly patented medicine is consistent with an efficient market. Patents expire after a certain period of time fixed by law. As economists have explained, during this period, prices will reflect both the costs of production and the company’s research and development costs. The exclusivity period that the patent creates attracts investment, which enables the innovator company to recoup its research and development costs. Once the patent expires, other companies may create generics that are priced lower. But these lower costs reflect the fact that copycat companies only need to recoup production costs, not research and development. In other words, a patent’s provision of an opportunity for an innovator company to recover costs enables it to produce the medicine in the first place. And the patent’s eventual expiration allows for robust competition that drives prices down. Third, as many experts point out, structural and economic barriers are a significant barrier to access to medicine in the developing world. Poor infrastructure and weak healthcare systems plague third-world countries. Several countries’ medical centers are located in remote areas that may only be reached through impassable roads. Also, many drugs and vaccines must be stored at certain temperatures. But many developing countries lack reliable electricity and sanitary facilities to enable proper storage. In India, for example, a quality-control study followed a series of vaccine vials through the supply-chain delivery process. The study found that 76 percent of the vaccines could not be used because they were stored in substandard storage facilities. Fourth, experts also acknowledge that developing countries tend to underinvest in health. In 2001, for example, African leaders met in Abuja, Nigeria, and pledged to allocate 15 percent of their national budgets to health. The 2015 DATA Report found, however, that between 2011 and 2013, just eight of the 47 countries for which there was data available spent 15 percent or more on health: Uganda, Rwanda, Malawi, Swaziland, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Liberia, and Togo. Twenty countries did not reach even the 10 percent level. If anything, patent protections could incentivize further investment in health in these countries. \* \* \* The UN has a real opportunity to address the critical issue of healthcare access. As it stands now, however, it seems poised to do more damage than good.

#### TRIPs waiver doesn’t solve- it doesn’t obligate countries to do anything, just makes it legal.

Mercurio 21 [Bryan; Professor of Law, The Chinese University of Hong Kong; "The IP Waiver for COVID-19: Bad Policy, Bad Precedent," 2021; 1-6. International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law.] Justin

It is not only the length of time which is an issue but also the ultimate impact of the waiver. A waiver simply means that a WTO Member would not be in violation of its WTO obligations if it does not protect and enforce the COVID-19-related IPRs for the duration of the waiver. The waiver would thus allow Members to deviate from their international obligations but not obligate Members to suspend protection and enforcement of the IPRs. Members like the US who support the waiver may not implement the necessary domestic legislation to waive IPRs within the jurisdiction. It is questionable whether the US could even legally implement the waiver given that IPRs are a matter of constitutional law.17

#### The first piece of Vanni evidence has no warrants for IP being the cause – rather it’s saying that lack of access to healthcare is what is causing disproportionate minority deaths.

It’s also about IP broadly, not MEDICAL IP – proves litany of alt causes.

#### TRIPS reduces global health inequality

Samir Raheem Alsoodani 15, “"The WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) may offered an access to essential pharmaceutical drugs for developing countries,” Journal Of the College of law /Al-Nahrain University 2015, Volume 17, Issue 2, Pages 393-410, <https://www.iasj.net/iasj/article/109180>

To conclude, it is beyond doubt that the TRIPS Agreement and its later, permanent amendment of 2005 attempted in good faith to address an urgent issue faced by many developing countries with regards to accessing essential medicine. To a certain extent in its basic tenets, it has had a profound and positive effect on the system, as it has made permanently possible the opportunity for the poorest countries to obtain medications more cheaply through manufacture in developing countries under a compulsory licensing system. Certain positive outcomes arguably include the fact that disputes have been brought under the jurisdiction of one regulatory body, and the least developed Members have found some redress in the power balance regarding costs paid to the pharmaceutical industries based in the wealthier, developed countries (even if this redress has only been to the extent of facilitating increased bargaining capability). This can be considered a triumph from the perspective of universal human rights.