### 1NC – Midterms DA

#### Dems win now – but the margins are razor thin – Texas abortion ban is going to rally dems to the polls – answers all thumpers

Behrmann & Bailey 9-9 [Savannah Behrmann, Congressional Reporter at USA TODAY. Previously, she was a News Associate at CNN. Savannah hails originally from Utah, and attended George Mason University., Phillip M. Bailey, National political correspondent, 9-9-2021, “Texas abortion law could hurt Republicans in 2022 midterm elections, experts say” USA Today, Accessed 9-11-2021, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2021/09/09/texas-abortion-law-may-hurt-republicans-2022-midterms-experts-say/570180001/> ww

WASHINGTON – As the United States pulled out of Afghanistan and chaos ensued, Republican lawmakers were swift to condemn President Joe Biden's handling of the withdrawal.¶ The violence that erupted in Kabul gave GOP officials an opening to attack the Democratic president, whose approach to the withdrawal was later met with disapproval in national polls. It quickly became political campaign fodder for Republicans who need a net gain of only five seats in the House and one in the Senate to recapture total control of Congress in next year's midterm elections.¶ Weeks later, conservatives were handed a victory when the Supreme Court sided with Texas Republicans in not blocking the most restrictive abortion law in the nation – in one of the United States' largest red states. But, unlike Afghanistan, it was met with a dim response from high-profile conservatives, most of whom didn't publicly celebrate the law that experts said could spell trouble for congressional Republicans when voters head to the polls next year.¶ 'Day of reckoning': GOP unified in blaming Biden for Afghanistan bombing, divided on refugees and next steps¶ Political strategists and academics pointed to a shifting narrative for people in the "middle" on abortion, and some suggested the new law may tilt too far to the right for even some in the Republican base. ¶ "Republicans have been bleeding support among suburban women throughout the Trump era," Republican pollster Whit Ayers told USA TODAY. "(Texas) makes that problem worse, not better."¶ A divided Supreme Court last week denied an effort by abortion rights groups to halt the new Texas law that bans people from having the procedure after six weeks of pregnancy. ¶ The Texas law, known as SB 8, and signed by Republican Gov. Greg Abbott in May, bans abortions when a fetal heartbeat is detected, usually at about six weeks. The law doesn't include traditional exceptions for abortion such as for rape or incest but allows women to have the procedure for "medical emergencies." ¶ 'Near-total ban': Texas doctors, women assess nation's strictest abortion law¶ The GOP base is largely religious and mostly anti-abortion. Around eight-in-ten Republican registered voters are Christian, and 63% of Republicans and those who lean toward the GOP say abortion should be illegal in all or most cases, according to Pew Research.¶ Brian Conley, professor of political science and director of the political science graduate program at Suffolk University, said that, especially following the Texas ruling and possibly others to come, the law may benefit the left because it may mobilize single-issue pro-choice voters. ¶ "It's galvanizing and solidifying as a single issue for a lot of folks because it appears as though we're on the precipice, if you will, of some type of meaningful change, some type of significant change in abortion rights in United States." ¶ Conley noted Afghanistan could have "really been a very big win for [Republicans] but then all of a sudden there's this other issue which, if you will, will probably displace discussions about Afghanistan."¶ New law may be too extreme¶ Although abortion remains one of the thornier issues in the country, surveys have shown a consistent consensus among most Americans who favor certain restrictions but oppose throwing out Roe v. Wade as a whole.¶ Asked whether the Supreme Court should “overturn” abortion or “let it stand” a month before the 2020 president contest, 62% of likely voters in a Fox News poll said the high court should let it remain.¶ Charles Bullock, a University of Georgia political science professor, said similar surveys showed the same thing.¶ A Quinnipiac University poll released during that time period found 66% of likely voters said they agreed with the 1973 decision establishing a woman’s right to terminate a pregnancy. And a Kaiser Family Foundation poll published in October 2020 showed 69% of Americans disagree with overturning Roe, including 76% of independents. ¶ Bullock said given the slim majorities controlling Congress, Republicans are pausing to calculate how the electorate will respond.¶ “Because while it may play very well in Texas, or at least in some legislative districts in Texas, (SB 8) may be a net loser nationwide,” he said.¶ If allowed to remain in force, the Texas law would be the most dramatic restriction on abortion rights in the U.S. since Roe v. Wade. Citing Roe, federal courts have shot down similar bans in other conservative states for years.¶ Pro-choice activists supporting legal access to abortion protest during a demonstration outside the US Supreme Court in Washington, D.C., in 2020.¶ But what makes the Texas law more controversial, and has rankled women's reproductive health advocates and providers – and may be difficult for Republicans to navigate in more moderate electorates – is a provision in the measure that deputizes individual citizens as the chief enforcer of the new anti-abortion rules.¶ Under that provision, private citizens can sue abortion providers and anyone involved in "aiding and abetting" abortions, including someone driving a person to an abortion clinic. A successful plaintiff could be entitled to at least $10,000 in damages, according to the law. ¶ Shana Kushner Gadarian, chair of political science at Syracuse University's Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, said within the Republican Party the average voter is not necessarily supportive of these types of bills, "even though they're more supportive of restricting access, or moving the timeline of when women can access abortion back."¶ "This kind of very extreme ban is not super popular," she said.¶ Imani Gandy, senior editor of law and policy at Rewire.News, said it's hard to imagine the legal ramifications if the Supreme Court or lower federal bench doesn't move against that piece of the law.¶ "It really does create this sort of mercenary society where we're a nation of people who are snitching and surveilling each other," she said.¶ Some GOP pollsters say giving other citizens the right to pursue enforcement could spark privacy concerns among parts of the base that have resisted COVID-19 regulations.¶ "The enforcement mechanism is truly a bizarre and probably unconstitutional," Ayers said. "The libertarian wing of the party will be appalled by the enforcement mechanism in SB 8."¶ All the while, abortion is top-of-mind for voters. ¶ Gallup reported 47% of those polled in May, months before the Supreme Court's decision, said the issue of abortion will be one of the most important factors in voting for a candidate of a major office. Simultaneously, 24% say they will vote only for candidates who share their views on abortion. That number is significantly higher than in other years. ¶ Republicans largely silent ¶ Major Republicans and conservative organizations haven't been proactive in voicing support for the bill since it went into effect, or have shunned whether they back the law. ¶ The National Republican Senatorial Committee, the campaign arm for Senate Republicans, did not post about the new Texas law on Twitter in the days following, but posted more than 20 times on Afghanistan. The organization did not post a public statement.¶ The Republican Governor's Association has not made any statement either in the past week, but it has retweeted Abbott's messages about immigration, election security and business and infrastructure investments. ¶ Similarly, the National Republican Congressional Committee, which raises money for House Republicans, did not post about the Texas law on social media, and no public statement was found. ¶ USA TODAY reached out to the Republican party's campaign arms for comment or direction to public statements and was told none were available. ¶ Texas' Republican Sens. John Cornyn and Ted Cruz, have been mostly silent on social media regarding the law, and posted no public statements. ¶ Sen. John Cornyn R-TX speaks about border security during a press conference with Sen. Ted Cruz R-TX at the Anzalduas International Bridge in Mission, Tx on Thursday, Jan. 10, 2019. The senators accompanied president President Donald Trump on his trip to the southern border earlier in the day. (Via OlyDrop)¶ Cornyn retweeted a few posts analyzing the bill and USA TODAY was told from his office they didn't have more at the moment to add. Cruz's office did not point USA TODAY to any public statement.¶ A spokesman for Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., told USA TODAY their office would forward any statements on the law if the GOP leader made any. But McConnell did offer a brief and reserved reaction about the law when speaking at an event in Kentucky last week.¶ “I think it was a highly technical decision,” he told reporters. “Whether it leads to a broader ruling on Roe vs. Wade is unclear at this point.”¶ House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy, R-Calif., hadn't posted a public statement, either. The official GOP Twitter account also had not mentioned the abortion bill.¶ Sen. Bill Cassidy, R-La., said on ABC News he believes the Supreme Court will ultimately overturn the Texas law, despite its refusal to last week. ¶ "I think the Supreme Court will swat it away once it comes to them in an appropriate manner. If it is as terrible as people say it is, it will be destroyed by the Supreme Court," Cassidy said.¶ As for Democrats, they've attacked the bill with vengeance. ¶ "The Supreme Court’s cowardly, dark-of-night decision to uphold a flagrantly unconstitutional assault on women’s rights and health is staggering," said House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., in a statement. “SB8 delivers catastrophe to women in Texas, particularly women of color and women from low-income communities."¶ Pelosi said the House will vote later this month on a bill that would protect the right to abortion across the country by codifying Roe v. Wade.¶ Congress:Pelosi says House will vote on abortion access bill in response to Supreme Court decision on Texas law¶ The bill brings abortion into high-profile races¶ The Texas law will likely play a role in next year's battle for the Senate where there is currently a 50-50 party breakdown.¶ In the battleground state of Pennsylvania, for instance, candidates from both sides are rushing to succeed retiring Republican Sen. Pat Toomey.¶ Democratic candidate Val Arkoosh pounced on the Texas abortion law, tweeting: "Say it with me: End the filibuster. Codify Roe v. Wade. The Senate should come back and do it — now."¶ The five-person Pennsylvania GOP field, however, has been mostly quiet.¶ None of the Republican contenders responded to USA TODAY's request for comment except for Craig Snyder, a former chief of staff for the late former Sen. Arlen Specter who is running as an anti-Trump candidate.¶ Snyder, who said he supports the unborn and "autonomy" of women, said the law is "clearly unconstitutional" based on Supreme Court precedent. He said it represents a sharp departure from what most general election voters think about abortion.¶ "I think it's another victory for extremism over the views of what I think is the American majority," Snyder said.¶ In other states, Republican candidates have avoided touting Texas' law specifically while still framing the abortion fight as a weakness for Democrats.¶ One of the high-profile races in 2021 will be Virginia's gubernatorial contest between Republican Glenn Youngkin and Democrat Terry McAuliffe.¶ The Youngkin campaign fired off a press release Tuesday afternoon chastising McAuliffe for his past comments on abortion, but it made no mention of the Texas law.¶ Youngkin dodged a CNN reporter when asked three times on Tuesday if a similar 6-week ban such as the one in Texas should be made law in Virginia, only saying that he's "pro-life."¶ Youngkin campaign spokeswoman Macaulay Porter said from the start of the race he's been an anti-abortion candidate, who "believes in exceptions in the case of rape, incest and when the mother’s life is in jeopardy."¶ "Terry McAuliffe is trying to divide us and distract from his own extreme, pro-abortion position," she said in a statement. "The Texas law is not something that is here in Virginia. What is in Virginia is Terry McAuliffe’s extreme agenda, which advocates for abortion, all the way up through and including birth.”¶ The McAuliffe campaign has gone on the offensive with a series of attack ads to remind Virginians about Youngkin's anti-abortion stances. It also revived a video released by a liberal activist in July showing Youngkin telling a voter he is keeping quiet about his anti-abortion views.¶ McAuliffe said if elected to another term he will "enshrine" abortion rights into the state constitution, and fight for new protections. He also expressed confidence that left-leaning and independent voters will come out big this November as a warning shot to Republicans in 2022 about how they have overstepped.¶ "The future of this country is going to be a battle to protect and preserve woman's rights to make their own decisions about their own body," McAuliffe said.¶ Supreme Court back in the spotlight?¶ Democrats see the Texas law as a way to remind voters of the importance of the Supreme Court — and how Senate control plays into that longer game.¶ Historically, the party not in control of the White House has success in midterms, which could have a direct impact on the court because the Senate is tasked with confirming nominees. With three Donald Trump nominees on the bench, conservatives now hold a comfortable 6-3 majority. ¶ Jazmin Vargas, the national press secretary for the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, said Democrats plan on highlighting the abortion ruling over the Texas law and the Supreme Court's power in the midterm elections.¶ “The freedom for women to make our own health care decisions is on the ballot in 2022 and in key Senate battleground states. Democrats will be holding Republican Senate candidates accountable for their anti-choice record and we will be reminding voters of the stakes in next year’s election – and why we must defend a Democratic Senate majority with the power to confirm or reject Supreme Court justices," she said in a statement to USA TODAY.¶ This Friday, Sept. 3, 2021, photo shows the Supreme Court in Washington. The Supreme Court's decision this past week not to interfere with the state's strict abortion law, provoked outrage from liberals and cheers from many conservatives. President Joe Biden assailed it. But the decision also astonished many that Texas could essentially outmaneuver Supreme Court precedent on women's constitutional right to abortion. (AP Photo/J. Scott Applewhite) ORG XMIT: DCSA117¶ The House Democrats' campaign arm also came out swinging on the new law. ¶ “We’re going to make clear to the American people that this type of draconian law – that targets people seeking reproductive care and places bounties on the heads of those who help them – risks becoming the norm under a Republican majority, and Democrats won’t allow that to happen," said Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee spokesperson Nebeyatt Betre.¶ But CNN political commentator Scott Jennings, a longtime Republican adviser, said Democrats and others should pump their brakes before thinking the lack of a GOP rally in the days after the Texas law took effect represents a tectonic shift in a nearly half-century old debate.¶ "Are there any voters out there who don't know that the Republican Party is the pro-life party and the Democratic Party is the abortion party? It's been a clear contour of our elections for a long time," he said.¶ Jennings said outside of Texas each conservative candidate at the Senate and gubernatorial level is making their own decision on how to handle the issue, but that the GOP isn't going to abandon its anti-abortion base. ¶ "There's an assumption by Democrats that they're going to be able to make an entire election about abortion, when you got runaway inflation, Afghanistan debacle and COVID is now re-surging," he said. ¶ Anti-abortion activists aren't fretting about Republican reticence thus far, saying that Texas legislators have inspired leaders in other Republican-controlled state legislatures to say they are looking to mimic the law.¶ "We are in the early days, so time will tell," said Kristan Hawkins, president of Students for Life of America. ¶ She said social conservative activists are inspired by the "innovative ways to protect life" that Texas Republicans used to enforce the 6-week ban and there is a growing expectation that politicians will follow through. ¶ "Empowering private citizens was a response to a legal and political class failing to do their jobs and enforce the law," Hawkins said.¶ The Supreme Court's work on abortion isn't over. The court is expected to hear a blockbuster challenge to Mississippi's ban on most abortions after 15 weeks of pregnancy.¶ That dispute, which could be argued at the court later this year and decided next summer right before the elections, is expected to address central questions about the constitutionality of abortion and restrictions on it imposed by states.¶ Ayers, the GOP pollster, said abortion will remain an "unresolvable moral issue" but added that Democratic and Republican campaigns are measuring how much Texas has tipped the political scales, even if by inches.¶ "Americans as a whole view abortion as a moral dilemma that I believe will never be fully resolved to the satisfaction of people on either extreme of the debate," he said.

#### The aff is massively unpopular – majority of voters oppose the aff – regardless of political affiliation

Schulte 5-4 [Gabriela Schulte, 5-4-2021, “Poll: Majority oppose proposal to temporarily waive intellectual property rights on COVID-19 vaccines” The Hill, Accessed 8-11-2021, <https://thehill.com/hilltv/what-americas-thinking/551797-poll-majority-oppose-proposal-to-temporarily-waive-intellectual> ww

A majority of voters oppose the proposal to temporarily waive intellectual property rights on COVID-19 vaccines, a new Hill-HarrisX poll finds.¶ The survey comes as the Biden administration faces mounting pressure to support a proposal led by India and South Africa that would waive an international intellectual property agreement that protects pharmaceutical trade secrets.¶ Backers of the move argue it would enable lower-income countries to manufacture the vaccines themselves while those opposed say it could make the vaccine less safe and damper production in existing locations.¶ Fifty-seven percent of registered voters in the May 3-4 survey said they oppose the proposal to waive intellectual property rights on COVID-19 vaccines. By contrast, 43 percent of respondents said they support the proposal. ¶ Sixty-four percent of Republican voters along with 52 percent of both Democratic and independent voters said they oppose waiving the intellectual property rights of vaccines.¶ "This is a complex issue with a remarkably sophisticated understanding by the public. The tension is as follows: On one hand you have the need to protect the intellectual property rights of the scientists and companies that brought about the fastest vaccine in history, and will likely need to produce new versions of the shot even faster to battle evolving strains," Dritan Nesho, chief researcher and CEO of HarrisX, told Hill.TV.¶ "On the other hand there’s the need to save lives, reaching global heard immunity and providing access to the vaccine as broadly and equitably as as possible," Nesho continued.¶ "Today a majority of 57 percent of U.S. voters would like to protect the intellectual property of vaccine makers, but as more and more people are vaccinated in advanced economies, voter pressure for broader and more equitable distribution will rise," Nesho added. "Already we see Democrats and independents here split on the issue of whether or not to waive IP rights to provide greater access to the vaccines."¶ President Biden is expected to weigh in on the proposal at a World Trade Organization meeting on Wednesday.¶ The most recent Hill-HarrisX poll was conducted online among 939 registered voters. It has a margin of error of 3.2 percentage points.

#### Midterm success k2 long term climate initiatives

Piotrowski et al 20 [Matt Piotrowski and Emma McMahon and Joshua McBee and Kyle Saukas, 12-14-2020, “Biden’s Climate Path Through the 2022 Midterms” Climate Advisers, <https://climateadvisers.org/blogs/bidens-climate-path-up-to-the-2022-midterms/> ww

\*Figures omitted\*

Joe Biden ran on a climate change agenda and has laid out his plans for early action, but what might the ‘medium-term’ for climate action and the 2022 midterms look like?¶ Beyond 2021¶ Although the configuration of the current Senate is not yet decided, political operatives are already looking forward to the 2022 mid-term election. If Democrats do not win both special elections in Georgia in January 2021, they will not have the majority in the Senate, which, as noted in earlier blogs, will greatly hamper the Democrats’ legislative agenda and make wide-ranging climate legislation a virtual impossibility.¶ However, they could capture the majority in 2022. U.S. Senators serve six-year terms, meaning that the same seats are up for re-election on a rotating six-year schedule. The seats up for re-election in 2022 pose better opportunities for Democratic gains than did the elections in 2018 or 2020, with three vulnerable Republican seats (see Figure 1 below).¶ It is too soon to tell what will happen in the mid-term elections, but the most recent data show Republicans are well-positioned to take back the House. Still, some Democrats are confident they can hold onto the House. If Democrats win majorities in both houses of Congress in 2022, then the second half of the Biden administration’s term could, unusually, be more productive than his first. This would give him greater opportunity to pass comprehensive climate legislation, which could include a carbon tax, major investments in green technology and infrastructure, and regulation of the energy sector. If Republicans maintain their lead in the Senate, with or without a majority in the House, it is unlikely that any of these would pass during Biden’s presidency.¶ With Congress shifting its focus to the mid-term elections in 2022, the Biden administration will still take advantage of its ability to advance climate initiatives in the executive branch. Increasing the use of clean fuels through government procurement, particularly in the military, is one major goal. The U.S. government spends approximately $500 billion per year on procurement, providing a large opportunity to develop a zero-emission transportation fleet. There will also be opportunities in rewriting agency rules and regulations (President Trump rolled back more than 100 environmental rules), increasing research and development in programs such as the Department of Energy’s Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, and prioritizing the climate issue in diplomacy.¶ At the state and local level, Republicans performed better than expected in this year’s election, gaining seats in state legislatures, giving them the advantage in the redistricting process next year. Whichever party has the ability to redraw districts, which is done every 10 years, has the power to increase the number of districts in their favor. This dynamic may help Republicans retake the U.S. House of Representatives and hold onto the majority for some time as they did from 2010-18. In the map below, the Republicans hold both the legislatures and the governorships of the states in red.¶ These state-level legislatures and governorships could set the political map for a decade to come in Republicans’ favor. This could lead to more state-level opposition to President Biden’s executive actions. The recently failed attempt by Texas’ Attorney General to sue swing states whose electoral votes secured Biden’s victory that was supported by the Attorney Generals of 17 other states is an early-warning sign of state vs. federal animosity. Additionally, these state wins for Republicans could influence voting laws to favor Republicans to be elected at the Federal level, further frustrating Biden and future Democrats’ efforts to pursue ambitious climate legislation.

#### Extinction.

Kareiva 18 [Peter,Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA, et al., September 2018, “Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back,” Futures, Vol. 102, p. 39-50

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (climate change, global freshwater cycle, and ocean acidification) do pose existential risks. This is because of intrinsic positive feedback loops, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all directly connected to the provision of food and water, and shortages of food and water can create conflict and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. Ample clean water is not a luxury—it is essential for human survival. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes. Humans are remarkably ingenious, and have adapted to crises throughout their history. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). However, the many stories of human ingenuity successfully addressing existential risks such as global famine or extreme air pollution represent environmental challenges that are largely linear, have immediate consequences, and operate without positive feedbacks. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that very warming can cause more CO2 release which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that forest fires will become more frequent and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This catastrophic fire embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that could catch humanity off-guard and produce a true apocalyptic event. Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that runaway climate change, and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks portends even greater existential risks. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

### 1NC – Innovation DA

#### Innovation high now, but continued investments are crucial to meet the demands

Furstenthal et al 20 [(Laura Furstenthal serves healthcare clients globally as well as not-for-profit organizations, governments, and Nobel laureates, guiding innovation in strategy, organization, research and development, commercialization, and operations), et al. “Healthcare Innovation: Building on Gains Made through the Crisis.” McKinsey & Company, McKinsey & Company, 12 Nov. 2020, www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/healthcare-innovation-building-on-gains-made-through-the-crisis. Accessed 6 Aug. 2021.] PW

Leaders should consider the lessons and achievements of the COVID-19 crisis in forging new innovation aspirations—and the mechanisms needed to execute them. Medicine is a living science that prides itself on continual discovery. In recent years, healthcare innovators have brought us artificial-intelligence algorithms that arguably read chest X-rays as well as or better than radiologists, inexpensive genomic sequencing that can guide personalized cancer treatments, and vast improvements in population health management through big data and analytics, to name just a few examples. While the COVID-19 pandemic has placed unparalleled demands on modern healthcare systems, the industry’s response has vividly demonstrated its resilience and ability to bring innovations to market quickly. But the crisis is likely far from over and the sector’s innovation capabilities must continue to rise to the challenges presented both by COVID-19 and the economic fallout from its spread. While many industries are facing unprecedented disruption, medicine and healthcare are uniquely affected given the nature of this crisis. For example, pharmaceutical companies racing to develop vaccines must also manage complex supply chains, new models for engagement with healthcare professionals, a largely remote workforce, and disruption to many clinical trials. Similarly, hospitals are caring for COVID-19 patients with evolving protocols while maintaining continuity of care for others, often against the backdrop of vulnerable staff, supply and equipment shortages, and, for some, accelerating financial headwinds. While the COVID-19 pandemic has placed unparalleled demands on modern healthcare systems, the industry’s response has vividly demonstrated its resilience and ability to bring innovations to market quickly. The effects of the pandemic on the industry continue to be profound. The shifts in consumer behavior, an [acceleration of established trends](https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/the-great-acceleration), and the likely deep and lasting economic impact will potentially affect healthcare companies no less—and quite possibly more—than those in other sectors. Around the world, more than [90 percent of executives](https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/innovation-in-a-crisis-why-it-is-more-critical-than-ever) we polled believe COVID-19 will fundamentally change their businesses, and 85 percent predict lasting changes in customers’ preferences. Among healthcare leaders, two-thirds expect this period to be the most challenging in their careers.1 To meet both the humanitarian challenge and the obligation to their stakeholders, leaders of healthcare organizations need to meet the innovation imperative. History tells us that organizations that invest in innovation during a crisis [outperform their peers in the recovery](https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/the-great-acceleration) (exhibit). What’s more, a crisis can create an urgency that rallies collaborative effort, breaks through organizational silos, and overcomes institutional inertia. Exhibit During the course of this year, the healthcare industry has produced inspiring examples of innovation in products, services, processes, and business and delivery models, often in partnership with other sectors. For example, Sheba Medical Center in Israel is working with TytoCare to keep COVID-19 patients in their homes by supplying them with special stethoscopes that both listen to their hearts and transmit images of their lungs to a care team that can intervene as appropriate.2 In the United States, Zipline, which specializes in delivering medical supplies to remote areas, quickly formed a partnership with Novant Health in North Carolina to distribute supplies to hospitals via drones.3 The adoption of telehealth has exploded, from 11 percent of consumers using it in 2019 to [46 percent in April 2020](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/healthcare-systems-and-services/our-insights/telehealth-a-quarter-trillion-dollar-post-covid-19-reality), and well more than half of healthcare providers polled indicate higher comfort with this care-delivery method than before. Given the speed of recent changes, it is likely that parts of the healthcare ecosystem will operate in different ways in the coming years. To keep pace with the industry’s evolution, healthcare leaders should consider assessing their organizations’ readiness to innovate at scale and whether the needed capabilities are in place. Our past research shows that successful innovation in large organizations stems from a commitment to eight principles and practices: aspire, choose, discover, evolve, accelerate, scale, extend, and mobilize. These [eight essentials of innovation](https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/the-eight-essentials-of-innovation), when applied as a group, enable businesses to innovate more successfully and [outperform their peers](https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/the-innovation-commitment). Here is how healthcare players can consider applying them to their unique context at this extraordinary time.

#### IPP is key to sustaining innovation – without protection pharma companies are not willing to take the risk of investing in a new drug out of fear they can’t make profit competing with generics

Grabowski Et Al 15[Henry G. Grabowski, Is a professor of economics at Duke University, in Durham, North Carolina., Joseph A. DiMasi, director of economic analysis at the Tufts Center for the Study of Drug Development, Tufts University, in Boston, Massachusetts. Genia Long, is a senior advisor at the Analysis Group, in Boston, Massachusetts. February 2015, “The Roles Of Patents And Research And Development Incentives In Biopharmaceutical Innovation” Health Affairs, Accessed 7-29-2021, <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hlthaff.2014.1047> ww

Technological innovation is widely recognized as a key determinant of economic and public health progress. 1,2 Patents and other forms of intellectual property protection are generally thought to play essential roles in encouraging innovation in biopharmaceuticals. This is because the process of developing a new drug and bringing it to market is long, costly, and risky, and the costs of imitation are low. After a new drug has been approved and is being marketed, its patents protect it from competition from chemically identical entrants (or entrants infringing on other patents) for a period of time. For firms to have an incentive to continue to invest in innovative development efforts, they must have an expectation that they can charge enough during this period to recoup costs and make a profit. After a drug’s patent or patents expire, generic rivals can enter the market at greatly reduced development cost and prices, providing added consumer benefit but eroding the innovator drug company’s revenues.¶ The Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984 (commonly known as the Hatch-Waxman Act) was designed to balance innovation incentives and generic price competition for new drugs (generally small-molecule chemical drugs, with some large-molecule biologic exceptions) by extending the period of a drug’s marketing exclusivity while providing a regulatory framework for generic drug approval. This framework was later changed to encompass so-called biosimilars for large-molecule (biologic) drugs through the separate Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009. Other measures have been enacted to provide research and development (R&D) incentives for antibiotics and drugs to treat orphan diseases and neglected tropical diseases.¶ Discussion continues about whether current innovation incentives are optimal or even adequate, given evolving public health needs and scientific knowledge. For instance, the House Energy and Commerce Committee recently embarked on the “21st Century Cures” initiative, 3 following earlier recommendations by the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology on responding to challenges in “propelling innovation in drug discovery, development, and evaluation.” 4¶ In this context, we discuss the importance of patents and other forms of intellectual property protection to biopharmaceutical innovation, given the unique economic characteristics of drug research and development. We also review the R&D incentives that complement patents in certain circumstances. Finally, we consider the pros and cons of selected voluntary (“opt-in”) or mandatory alternatives to the current patent- and regulatory exclusivity–based system (such as prizes or government-contracted drug development) and whether they could better achieve the dual goals of innovation incentives and price competition.¶ The Role Of Patents In Biopharmaceutical Innovation¶ The essential rationale for patent protection for biopharmaceuticals is that long-term benefits in the form of continued future innovation by pioneer or brand-name drug manufacturers outweigh the relatively short-term restrictions on imitative cost competition associated with market exclusivity. Regardless, the entry of other branded agents remains an important source of therapeutic competition during the patent term.¶ Several economic characteristics make patents and intellectual property protection particularly important to innovation incentives for the biopharmaceutical industry. 5 The R&D process often takes more than a decade to complete, and according to a recent analysis by Joseph DiMasi and colleagues, per new drug approval (including failed attempts), it involves more than a billion dollars in out-of-pocket costs. 6 Only approximately one in eight drug candidates survive clinical testing. 6¶ As a result of the high risks of failure and the high costs, research and development must be funded by the few successful, on-market products (the top quintile of marketed products provide the dominant share of R&D returns). 7,8 Once a new drug’s patent term and any regulatory exclusivity provisions have expired, competing manufacturers are allowed to sell generic equivalents that require the investment of only several million dollars and that have a high likelihood of commercial success. Absent intellectual property protections that allow marketing exclusivity, innovative firms would be unlikely to make the costly and risky investments needed to bring a new drug to market.¶ Patents confer the right to exclude competitors for a limited time within a given scope, as defined by patent claims. However, they do not guarantee demand, nor do they prevent competition from nonidentical drugs that treat the same diseases and fall outside the protection of the patents.¶ New products may enter the same therapeutic class with common mechanisms of action but different molecular structures (for example, different statins) or with differing mechanisms of action (such as calcium channel blockers and angiotensin receptor blockers). 9 Joseph DiMasi and Laura Faden have found that the time between a first-in-class new drug and subsequent new drugs in the same therapeutic class has been dramatically reduced, from a median of 10.2 years in the 1970s to 2.5 years in the early 2000s. 10 Drugs in the same class compete through quality and price for preferred placement on drug formularies and physicians’ choices for patient treatment.¶ Patents play an essential role in the economic “ecosystem” of discovery and investment that has developed since the 1980s. Hundreds of start-up firms, often backed by venture capital, have been launched, and a robust innovation market has emerged. 11 The value of these development-stage firms is largely determined by their proprietary technologies and the candidate drugs they have in development. As a result, the strength of intellectual property protection plays a key role in funding and partnership opportunities for such firms.¶ Universities also play a key role in the R&D ecosystem because they conduct basic biomedical research supported by sponsored research grants from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF). The Patent and Trademark Law Amendments Act of 1980 (commonly known as the Bayh-Dole Act) gave universities the right to retain title to patents and discoveries made through federally funded research. This change was designed to encourage technology transfer through industry licensing and the creation of start-up companies. Universities received only 390 patents for their discoveries in 1980, 12 compared to 4,296 in 2011, with biotechnology and pharmaceuticals being the top two technology areas (accounting for 36 percent of all university patent awards in 2012). 13

#### Inevitable rapidly mutating pandemics – medical innovation key to solve

Sachs 14 [Professor of Sustainable Development, Health Policy and Management @ Columbia University [Jeffrey D. Sachs (Director of the Earth Institute @ Columbia University and Special adviser to the United Nations Secretary-General on the Millennium Development Goals) “Important lessons from Ebola outbreak,” Business World Online, August 17, 2014, <http://tinyurl.com/kjgvyro> ]

Ebola **is the latest of many** recent **epidemics**, also **including** AIDS, SARS, H1N1 **flu, H7N9 flu**, and others. AIDS is the deadliest of these killers, claiming nearly 36 million lives since 1981. Of course, even larger **and more** sudden epidemics are possible, such as the 1918 influenza during World War I, which claimed 50-100 million lives (far more than the war itself). And, though the 2003 SARS outbreak was contained, causing fewer than 1,000 deaths, the disease was on the verge of deeply disrupting several East Asian economies including China’s. **There are four crucial facts to understand about** Ebola and the other **epidemics**. First, **most emerging infectious diseases** are zoonoses, meaning that they **start in animal populations**, sometimes **with a genetic mutation that enables the jump to humans**. Ebola may have been transmitted from bats; HIV/AIDS emerged from chimpanzees; SARS most likely came from civets traded in animal markets in southern China; and influenza strains such as H1N1 and H7N9 arose from genetic re-combinations of viruses among wild and farm animals. New zoonotic diseases are inevitable as humanity pushes into new ecosystems (such as formerly remote forest regions); t**he** food industry creates **more** conditions for genetic recombination; and climate change scrambles natural habitats **and species interactions**. Second, **once a new infectious disease appears, its** spread through airlines, ships, megacities, and trade in animal products is likely to be extremely rapid. **These epidemic diseases are new markers of globalization, revealing** through their chain of death how **vulnerable the world has become** from the pervasive movement of people and goods. Third, the poor are **the first to suffer and** the worst affected. **The** rural **poor live closest to the infected animals that first transmit the disease**. They often hunt and eat bushmeat, leaving them vulnerable to infection. **Poor**, often illiterate, **individuals are generally unaware of how infectious diseases** -- especially unfamiliar diseases -- are transmitted, making them much more likely to become infected and to infect others. Moreover, given poor nutrition and lack of **access to basic** health services, their weakened **immune** systems are **easily** overcome by infections **that better nourished** and treated individuals **can survive**. And “de-medicalized” conditions -- with few if any professional health workers to ensure an appropriate public-health response to an epidemic (such as isolation of infected individuals, tracing of contacts, surveillance, and so forth) -- make initial outbreaks more severe. Finally, **the required** medical responses, including diagnostic tools and effective medications and vaccines, inevitably lag behind the emerging diseases. In any event, such tools must be continually replenished. This requires cutting-edge biotech**nology, immunology, and** ultimately **bioengineering** to create **large-scale** industrial responses (such as millions of doses of vaccines or medicines in the case of large epidemics). The AIDS crisis, for example, called forth tens of billions of dollars for research and development -- and similarly substantial commitments by the pharmaceutical industry -- to produce lifesaving antiretroviral drugs at global scale. Yet each breakthrough **inevitably** leads to **the** pathogen’s mutation, rendering previous treatments less effective. There is no ultimate victory, only a constant arms race **between humanity and disease-causing agents**.

#### Disease is a non-linear, existential risk---encompasses AND outweighs other threats

Pamlin & Armstrong 15, Dennis Pamlin, Executive Project Manager Global Risks, Global Challenges Foundation, and Stuart Armstrong, James Martin Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford, February 2015, “Global Challenges: 12 Risks that threaten human civilization: The case for a new risk category,” Global Challenges Foundation, p.30-93, https://api.globalchallenges.org/static/wp-content/uploads/12-Risks-with-infinite-impact.pdf

4 Global A pandemic (from Greek πᾶν, pan, “all”, and δῆμος demos, “people”) is an epidemic of infectious disease that has spread through human populations across a large region; for instance several continents, or even worldwide. Here only worldwide events are included. A widespread endemic disease that is stable in terms of how many people become sick from it is not a pandemic. 260 84 Global Challenges – Twelve risks that threaten human civilisation – The case for a new category of risks 3.1 Current risks 3.1.4.1 Expected impact disaggregation 3.1.4.2 Probability Influenza subtypes266 Infectious diseases have been one of the greatest causes of mortality in history. Unlike many other global challenges pandemics have happened recently, as we can see where reasonably good data exist. Plotting historic epidemic fatalities on a log scale reveals that these tend to follow a power law with a small exponent: many plagues have been found to follow a power law with exponent 0.26.261 These kinds of power laws are heavy-tailed262 to a significant degree.263 In consequence most of the fatalities are accounted for by the top few events.264 If this law holds for future pandemics as well,265 then the majority of people who will die from epidemics will likely die from the single largest pandemic. Most epidemic fatalities follow a power law, with some extreme events – such as the Black Death and Spanish Flu – being even more deadly.267 There are other grounds for suspecting that such a highimpact epidemic will have a greater probability than usually assumed. All the features of an extremely devastating disease already exist in nature: essentially incurable (Ebola268), nearly always fatal (rabies269), extremely infectious (common cold270), and long incubation periods (HIV271). If a pathogen were to emerge that somehow combined these features (and influenza has demonstrated antigenic shift, the ability to combine features from different viruses272), its death toll would be extreme. Many relevant features of the world have changed considerably, making past comparisons problematic. The modern world has better sanitation and medical research, as well as national and supra-national institutions dedicated to combating diseases. Private insurers are also interested in modelling pandemic risks.273 Set against this is the fact that modern transport and dense human population allow infections to spread much more rapidly274, and there is the potential for urban slums to serve as breeding grounds for disease.275 Unlike events such as nuclear wars, pandemics would not damage the world’s infrastructure, and initial survivors would likely be resistant to the infection. And there would probably be survivors, if only in isolated locations. Hence the risk of a civilisation collapse would come from the ripple effect of the fatalities and the policy responses. These would include political and agricultural disruption as well as economic dislocation and damage to the world’s trade network (including the food trade). Extinction risk is only possible if the aftermath of the epidemic fragments and diminishes human society to the extent that recovery becomes impossible277 before humanity succumbs to other risks (such as climate change or further pandemics). Five important factors in estimating the probabilities and impacts of the challenge: 1. What the true probability distribution for pandemics is, especially at the tail. 2. The capacity of modern international health systems to deal with an extreme pandemic. 3. How fast medical research can proceed in an emergency. 4. How mobility of goods and people, as well as population density, will affect pandemic transmission. 5. Whether humans can develop novel and effective anti-pandemic solutions.

### 1NC – Price Controls CP

#### Text: The member nations of the world trade organization should reform their price control polices for Pharmaceuticals

#### That solves

**Lee Et Al 5-6** [Kah Seng Lee, Yaman, Nur Akmar Taha, Zainol Akbar Zainal, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Cyberjaya, Cyberjaya, Selangor, Malaysia. Walid Kassab, Faculty of Pharmacy, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Puncak Alam, Selangor, Malaysia. “A systematic review of pharmaceutical price mark-up practice and its implementation” Exploratory Research in Clinical and Social Pharmacy, Volume 2, available online 5-6-2021, Accessed 6-27-2021, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcsop.2021.100020>. Ww

4. Discussion¶ Our current review examines the schematic and regulatory framework of pharmaceutical distribution and mark-ups in the identified countries. Technically, the medicine price is considered as fair if it is affordable to the patient while covering the retailer's costs plus a reasonable profit margin. Contradictorily, from the patient's point of view, a drug price is considered as “fair” when it is affordable, sustainable, and value for money. Perhaps it is contentious to determine the accepted profit margin of a medicine price. This is because fairness in drug prices does not solely reflect the benefit of buyers. Fairness means the policy is advantageous towards the patients too. A fair price should be **inclusive of** manufacturing **costs**, research and development costs, licensing costs, and a reasonable amount of profit. This is known as the price floor. The **price ceiling** is **determined by these factors**. A **fair price** which benefits both parties should be **within the** range of price **floor** **and** price **ceiling**. If a policy places the drug pricing under the price floor, it is undeniable that drug manufacturers and sellers would be forced to delay the production of drugs. Likewise, if a policy favours the sellers and sets drug prices above the ceiling, people would not be able to afford them, thus jeopardizing the balance of supply and demand.¶ Different countries adopt their own methods of pharmaceutical market management. Some countries employ various medical and pharmaceutical policies to balance the incurred healthcare costs and income generated from mark-ups. Others, like Italy, Norway and France, provide subsidies or do not charge for medication in public healthcare facilities. Most countries have implemented price control mechanisms as recommended by the WHO, such as external reference pricing which is commonly used by most European countries to determine the mark-up margin.38,39 The external reference pricing uses the price of a pharmaceutical product in one or several countries to derive a benchmark or reference price in order to set or negotiate the price of the product in the host country.2 Such a mechanism is not without its drawbacks. First, pricing estimation using external reference pricing will be inaccurate if the market intelligence collected the wrong medicine pricing details, including in terms of strength, dosage size, pack size and active ingredients.38,39 Second, setting a low price for a medicine measured using external referencing pricing could potentially lead to a medicine going out of stock in a particular country simply because the pharmaceutical companies will tend to divert supply to neighbouring countries that offer a better price.40¶ Our findings indicate that the majority of studies on drug pricing mark-ups have been conducted in European countries. In fact, there is a lack of pharmaceutical price control especially in developing countries, for example Chile, Ghana and Somalia.41 The absence of price control policies leads to unregulated selling price. Although the price of drugs may be cheaper in such regions compared to Europe and the USA, the quality of drugs might be compromised.42,43 Furthermore, it is difficult to compare drug-pricing mark-ups among different countries, since not all of them are applying mark-up controls consistently across all type of medicines. A clearer picture will be presented if more studies focusing on medicine mark-ups are done according to the drug pharmacological grouping.¶ Among the nine Western countries examined, only the UK imposed a price cap system, which controlled the maximum retail mark-ups at 21% of the wholesale price. Italy was the sole country where fixed fees and regressive fixed fees were regulated at the retailer level.30 In general, price mark-ups across the pharmaceutical supply chain in Western countries fall within the range of 4% to 25%, which is almost 50% lower than Asian countries. This may be a consequence of the countries' varying political stances, financial situations, and pharmaceutical regulations.44,45 Most Europeans are protected by a national medical scheme or health insurance.46 The reason behind these measures might be that the original price of the drug is already high.47 Many pharmaceutical companies manufacture their products in Asia, due to the cheaper labour costs and easier access to raw materials. It seems prudent to propose that an import cost is should be added on top of the original drug price, making it difficult to raise the mark-up ceiling level in Western countries.¶ The advent of effective and reliable biologics and precision medicines are taking the pharmaceutical industry a big step forward. But new, highly individualized **drugs are meaningless** if most patients are **unable to afford** them. Similarly, there is no point in pumping funds into pharmaceutical research and development when the investors are unable to sustain the pharmaceutical lifecycle management. Hence, **every country should have a price control policy to protect the lives of patients**, and the livelihood of pharmaceutical industry players.48¶ **With price regulation, patients are able to afford medications which in most cases are extremely important to keep them healthy**.49 In the USA, it is often being cited that prescription medications are more expensive than in other countries in the region. It is estimated that around **30% of patients in the USA are unable to afford their prescriptions**, and later succumb to their illnesses.50,51 Since drugs are essential to healthcare, some companies are taking advantage of their blockbuster drugs that monopolize the market. With price control measures in place, **this situation could be avoided**. However, controlling the selling price of medicine might lead to price fluctuation in other parts of the pharmaceutical supply chain. For example, drug utilization tends to increase if the price of a drug is decreased tremendously. On the contrary, in tandem with the price drop, unfavourable marketing could lead to less demand and subsequent rationing. The equilibrium of drug supply and demand might be at risk due to the manufacturers' unwillingness to produce the required volume of drugs. In most cases, pharmaceutical companies rely on high profit margins of drug sales to sustain research and development. For instance, the leading pharma companies have drastically slashed budgets for antibiotic innovation due to an unfavourable return of investment caused by the fast development of antibiotic resistance.52,53

### 1NC -- Util

#### The standard is Maximizing expected well-being –

#### 1] Binding – pain and pleasure are the only things with intrinsic value and disvalue – if I put my hand on a hot stove I will pull away – ethics must be binding bc if they arent then its impossible to generate obligations

#### 2] Death is bad – it’s impossible to pursue pleasure if you are dead, that means that we should always try to prevent death to give subjects the ability to pursue pleasure.

#### 3] Actor specificity – Governments have the obligation to maximize the pleasure of their citizens – proven through laws that are desiged to stop pain towards other subjects – Drunk driving laws, murder, robbery ect.

4] Moral uncertainty means extinction first  
**Bostrom 12** [Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)]  
These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ **Our present understanding of axiology might** well **be confused. We may not** nowknow — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet **be able to imagine the best ends** of our journey. **If we are** indeedprofoundly **uncertain** about our ultimate aims,then we should recognize that **there is a great** option **value in preserving** — and ideally improving — **our ability to recognize value and** to **steer the future accordingly. Ensuring** that **there will be a future** version of **humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value.** To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

# Case

## Framing

Analytics

## Contentions – group them

#### 1] no solvency – no ev that says access increases when you vote aff – just that its bad when there isn’t access

#### 2] extinction ows – it’s a prequsite

### Alt Causes – Branding

#### Alt cause – companies increase prices to protect their brand name and signal quality

Kyle 14[(Margaret Kyle is a noted authority on competition and intellectual property in the pharmaceutical industry.), et al. NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS and ACCESS to INNOVATION: EVIDENCE from TRIPS. , 2014.] PW

There are alternative explanations for a change in prices unrelated to non-IP policy shifts or political pressures. First, if originators are more willing to launch new products when they are protected by IPRs, the set of products available in a market will expand. This larger set of products may include those for which patents shifted the expected quantity sold by the innovator more than the price commanded (especially in relatively poor countries, where demand may be more elastic). In other words, the adoption of patents may have encouraged the launch of products with lower prices, for which innovators could not cover the fixed costs of launch without the assurance of 100% market share. Another explanation is related to the form of competition in developing markets. While generic products in developed countries are usually considered (nearly) perfect substitutes for the original product, emerging markets often see competition between “branded” generics, where real or perceived quality may vary across firms. In these environments, firms may incur some costs to develop and protect their brand names, or use price to signal quality. It is possible that by allocating the entire market to the originator, TRIPS-related IPRs have eliminated the need to differentiate from other producers of the same molecule; lower costs allow lower prices.

### CT – Foreign Investment

#### Strong IP laws benefit developing countries by inducing foreign investment

Ezell and Cory 19

Stephen Ezell (vice president of global innovation policy at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation; founder of Peer Insight, an innovation research and consulting firm) and Nigel Cory (associate director covering trade policy at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation; formerly a researcher in the South‐ east Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and worked for eight years in Australia’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade). “The Way For‐ ward for Intellectual Property Internationally.” Information Technology & Innovation Foundation. 25 April 2019. JDN. https://itif.org/publications/2019/04/25/way‐forward‐ intellectual‐property‐internationally || cut SM

* FDI = Foreign Direct Investment
* Reform =/= the aff, but rather strengthening IPR in developing countries

Studies have also shown how the benefits of intellectual property extend to developing countries. Diwan and Rodrik demonstrated that stronger patent rights in developing countries give enterprises from developed countries a greater incentive to research and introduce technologies appropriate to developing countries.42 Similarly, Taylor showed that weak patent rights in developing countries lead enterprises from developed countries to introduce less‐than‐best‐practice technologies to developing countries.43 Interestingly, the relationship goes in both directions. Branstetter and Saggi showed that strengthened IPR protection not only improves the investment climate in the implementing countries, but also leads to increased FDI in the country producing the original innovation.44 They concluded that IPR reform in the “global South” (e.g., developing countries) may be associated with FDI increases in the “global North” (e.g., developed countries). As northern firms shift their production to southern affiliates, this FDI accelerates southern industrial development, creating a cyclical feedback mechanism that also benefits the North. Another study by Liao and Wong, which focused on firm‐level analysis, highlights the inter‐relationship of IPR reform in developed and developing countries. Their study concluded that developing countries can entice technology transfer from the North by providing IPR protection for incoming products (although they note there is a need for redoubled R&D efforts in developed countries to spur needed innovations).45

### CT – K2 Medicine

#### Access isn’t unique to med but strong IP helps developing country innovators solve medical problems

Ezell and Cory 19

Stephen Ezell (vice president of global innovation policy at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation; founder of Peer Insight, an innovation research and consulting firm) and Nigel Cory (associate director covering trade policy at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation; formerly a researcher in the South‐ east Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and worked for eight years in Australia’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade). “The Way For‐ ward for Intellectual Property Internationally.” Information Technology & Innovation Foundation. 25 April 2019. JDN. https://itif.org/publications/2019/04/25/way‐forward‐ intellectual‐property‐internationally || cut SM

Many opponents of robust IPR rights view them as antithetical to the interests of developing countries in terms of access to medicines or the provision of national health care services. Yet the reality is that stronger IPR rights in developing nations actually unleash the power of developing‐country innovators to contribute to solving health challenges both in their own nations and across the global economy.

First, opponents of IP fail to recognize that intellectual property rights matter for health care innovation in emerging economies. An Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF) and George Mason University Center for Intellectual Property Protection report, “How Innovators Are Solving Global Health Challenges,” provides 25 case studies that show innovators in developing countries relying on IP to invent and bring solutions to market.57 The 25 case studies revealed a number of key themes, including that there is opportunity in adapting health care interventions for developing‐country environments where resources and infrastructure are scarce, and that local innovation and IP can contribute substantially toward providing both affordable and robust tests for diagnosing diseases and affordable interventions to meet basic needs in challenging environments.

Second, opponents of IP tend to ignore broader systemic issues that contribute to poor health care outcomes in developing countries. While cost is a central factor for policymakers in all countries, given resource scarcity, these trade‐offs are not unique to health. The greater the resource scarcity, the greater the need for innovation. One of the biggest challenges policymakers and innovators in developing countries confront again and again is scarcity—in access to trained professionals, in transportation, and in other infrastructure. For example, reports estimate that as many as 1 billion people lack access to essential health care because of a shortage of trained health professionals.58 A 2014 World Health Organization study estimated a shortage of 7 million public health care workers, with that number expected to rise to 13 million by 2035.59 More than 80 countries currently fail to meet the basic threshold of 23 skilled health professionals per 10,000 citizens.60 The challenge is even more daunting when it comes to specialists. For instance, Cameroon has fewer than 50 cardiologists supporting a population of over 23 million citizens.61 And Ethiopia, a country of some 90 million residents, is served by a single radiation‐treatment center located in the capital of Addis Ababa.62 In other instances, individuals lack access to essential medicines, with cost being a relatively small part of the problem. For instance, in 2014, researchers at the University of Utrecht in the Netherlands found that, on average, essential medicines are available in public‐sector facilities in developing countries only 40 percent of the time.63 Again, the cost of medicines is far from the most serious problem in the provision of health care services in developing nations. Indeed, the vast majority of drugs—at least 95 percent—on the World Health Organization’s Essential Medicines list are off‐patent, and thus potentially available in generic versions.64 The problem, in much larger part, stems from countries’ underdeveloped health systems and the fact that many people live in rural areas far from care. Stronger IP rights create an environment wherein entrepreneurs can innovate to meet health challenges in their own nations, the benefits thereof spilling over to benefit the entire international community.