# 1NC

## 1

#### 1] Interpretation: The affirmative must specify a] which intellectual property rights they reduce and b] to what degree they reduce them.

#### Intellectual Property is a vague, meaningless term – there’s no normal means.

Chopra 18, Samir. “The Idea of Intellectual Property Is Nonsensical and Pernicious: Aeon Essays.” Aeon, Aeon Magazine, 12 Nov. 2018, aeon.co/essays/the-idea-of-intellectual-property-is-nonsensical-and-pernicious. Samir Choprais professor of philosophy at Brooklyn College of the City University of New York. He is the author of several books, including A Legal Theory for Autonomous Artificial Agents (2011), co-authored with Laurence White.//sid

In the United States, media and technology have been shaped by these laws, and indeed many artists and creators owe their livelihoods to such protections. But recently, in response to the new ways in which the digital era facilitates the creation and distribution of scientific and artistic products, the foundations of these protections have been questioned. Those calling for reform, such as the law professors Lawrence Lessig and James Boyle, free software advocates such as Richard Stallman, and law and economics scholars such as William Landes and Judge Richard Posner, ask: is ‘intellectual property’ the same kind of property as ‘tangible property’, and are legal protections for the latter appropriate for the former? And to that query, we can add: **is ‘intellectual property’ an appropriate general term for the widely disparate areas of law it encompasses**? The answer to all these questions is **no**. And answering the latter question will help to answer the former. Stallman is a computer hacker extraordinaire and the fieriest exponent of the free-software movement, which holds that computer users and programmers should be free to copy, share and distribute software source code. He has argued that the term ‘intellectual property’ be discarded in favour of the precise and directed use of ‘copyright’, ‘patents’, ‘trademarks’ or ‘trade secrets’ instead – and he’s right. This is not merely semantic quibbling. The language in which a political and cultural debate is conducted very often determines its outcome. Stallman notes that **copyright, patent, trademark and trade secret law were motivated by widely differing considerations**. Their intended purposes, the objects covered and the permissible constraints all vary. In fact, knowledge of **one body of law rarely carries over to another**. (A common confusion is to imagine that an object protected by one area of law is actually protected by another: ‘McDonald’s’ is protected by trademark law, not copyright law, as many consumers seem to think.) Such diversity renders most ‘general statements … using “intellectual property”… false,’ Stallman [writes](https://www.gnu.org/philosophy/not-ipr.en.html). Consider the common claim that intellectual property promotes innovation: this is actually true only of patent law. Novels are copyrighted even if they are formulaic, and copyright only incentivises the production of new works as public goods while allowing creators to make a living. These limited rights do not address innovations, which is also true of trademark and trade secret law. Crucially, ‘intellectual property’ is only partially concerned with rewarding creativity (that motivation is found in copyright law alone). Much more than creativity is ‘needed to make a patentable invention’, Stallman explains, while trademark and trade secret law are orthogonal to creativity or its encouragement. Clubbing these diversities under the term ‘intellectual property’ has induced a terrible intellectual error A general term is useful only if it subsumes related concepts in such a way that semantic value is added. If our comprehension is not increased by our chosen generalised term, then we shouldn’t use it. A common claim such as ‘they stole my intellectual property’ is singularly uninformative, since the general term ‘intellectual property’ obscures more than it illuminates. If copyright infringement is alleged, we try to identify the copyrightable concrete expression, the nature of the infringement and so on. If patent infringement is alleged, we check another set of conditions (does the ‘new’ invention replicate the design of the older one?), and so on for trademarks (does the offending symbol substantially and misleadingly resemble the protected trademark?) and trade secrets (did the enterprise attempt to keep supposedly protected information secret?) The use of the general term ‘intellectual property’ tells us precisely nothing. Furthermore, the extreme **generality** encouraged by ‘intellectual property’ **obscures the specific areas of contention** created by the varying legal regimes. Those debating copyright law wonder whether the copying of academic papers should be allowed; patent law is irrelevant here. Those debating **patent law** wonder whether pharmaceutical companies should have to issue **compulsory licences** for life-saving drugs to poor countries; **copyright law is irrelevant** here. ‘**Fair use’** is **contested in copyright** litigation; there is **no such notion in patent law**. ‘**Non-obviousness’** is **contested in patent law**; there is **no such** notion **in copyright law**. **Clubbing these diversities under the term ‘intellectual property’ has induced a terrible intellectual error**: **facile and misleading overgeneralisation**. Indiscriminate use of ‘intellectual property’ has unsurprisingly bred absurdity. Anything associated with a ‘creator’ – be it artistic or scientific – is often grouped under ‘intellectual property’, which doesn’t make much sense. And the widespread embrace of ‘intellectual property’ has led to historical amnesia. According to Stallman, many Americans have held that ‘the framers of the US Constitution had a principled, procompetitive attitude to intellectual property’. But Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8 of the US Constitution authorises only copyright and patent law. It does not mention trademark law or trade secret law. Why then does ‘intellectual property’ remain in use? Because it has polemical and rhetorical value. Its deployment, especially by a putative owner, is a powerful inducement to change one’s position in a policy argument. It is one thing to accuse someone of copyright infringement, and another to accuse of them of the theft of property. The former sounds like a legally resolvable technicality; the latter sounds like an unambiguously sinful act.

#### 2] Violation: they don’t

#### 3] Standards

#### a] Shiftiness – vague plan wording wrecks Neg Ground since it’s impossible to know which DAs link or which CPs are competitive since different IP’s have different implications – absent 1AC specification, the 1AR can squirrel out of links by saying they don’t effect a certain protection or they don’t reduce IP enough to trigger the link.

#### b] Topic Education – nuanced debates about IP requires specification since each form of IPR has specific issues related to it so generalization disincentivizes in-depth research. Topic Education is a voter since we only debate the topic for two months.

#### Neg theory is DTD - 1ARs control the direction of the debate because it determines what the 2NR has to go for – DTD allows us some leeway in the round by having some control in the direction

#### Competing interps – Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation – it also collapses since brightlines operate on an offense-defense paradigm

#### No RVIs – A – Going all in on theory kills substance education which outweighs on timeframe B - Discourages checking real abuse which outweighs on norm-setting C – Encourages theory baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly D – its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments E - Kills norm setting since debaters can never admit they’re wrong – outweighs since norm setting is the constitutive purpose of theory F – They are the logic of criminalization that over-punish people-of-color for trying to create productive discourse

## 2

#### 1] Interpretation - Reduce means permanent reduction – it’s distinct from “waive” or “suspend.”

**Reynolds 59** (Judge (In the Matter of Doris A. Montesani, Petitioner, v. Arthur Levitt, as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al., Respondents [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL] Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department 9 A.D.2d 51; 189 N.Y.S.2d 695; 1959 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 7391 August 13, 1959, lexis)

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway.  [\*\*\*13] The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency.

#### Waiver is temporary.

Green 5/6 [Andrew Green (Devex Contributing Reporter based in Berlin, his coverage focuses primarily on health and human rights and he has previously worked as Voice of America's South Sudan bureau chief and the Center for Public Integrity's web editor). “US backs waiver for intellectual property rights for COVID-19 vaccines”. Devex. 06 May 2021. Accessed 7/31/2021. <https://www.devex.com/news/us-backs-waiver-for-intellectual-property-rights-for-covid-19-vaccines-99847> //Xu]

In a stunning reversal, U.S. President Joe Biden’s administration came out in favor of waiving intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines Wednesday. The move follows months of U.S. opposition that began under former President Donald Trump to a proposal from South Africa and India to temporarily set aside intellectual property rights around products that would protect, contain, and treat COVID-19. Its supporters have argued that the proposal, first tabled at the World Trade Organization in October and now backed by more than 100 countries, is necessary to expand vaccine production and overcome global shortages.

#### 2] Violation – the plan waives intellectual property protections “during pandemics”, which is an suspension – don’t let them get We Meets since their Plan defends a waiver.

#### 3] Vote neg for limits and neg ground – re-instatement under any infinite number of conditions doubles aff ground – every plan becomes either temporary or permanent – you cherry-pick the best criteria and I must prep every aff while they avoid core topic discussions like reduction-based DAs which decks generics like Pharma Innovation and Bio-Tech.

#### 4] TVA solves – permanently reduce COVID patents.

## 4

#### Climate Patents and Innovation high now and solving Warming but COVID waiver sets a dangerous precedent for appropriations - the mere threat is sufficient is enough to kill investment.

Brand 5-26, Melissa. “Trips Ip Waiver Could Establish Dangerous Precedent for Climate Change and Other Biotech Sectors.” IPWatchdog.com | Patents & Patent Law, 26 May 2021, www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/26/trips-ip-waiver-establish-dangerous-precedent-climate-change-biotech-sectors/id=133964/. //sid

The **biotech** industry is making remarkable **advances towards climate change solutions**, and it is precisely for this reason that it can expect to be in the crosshairs of potential IP waiver discussions. President Biden is correct to refer to climate change as an existential crisis. Yet it does not take too much effort to connect the dots between President Biden’s focus on climate change and his Administration’s recent commitment to waive global IP rights for Covid vaccines (TRIPS IP Waiver). “This is a global health crisis, and the extraordinary circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures.” If an IP waiver is purportedly necessary to solve the COVID-19 global health crisis (and of course [we dispute this notion](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/04/19/waiving-ip-rights-during-times-of-covid-a-false-good-idea/id=132399/)), can we really feel confident that this or some future Administration will not **apply** the **same logic to** the **climate crisis**? And, without the confidence in the underlying IP for such solutions, what does this mean for U.S. innovation and economic growth? United States Trade Representative (USTR) [Katherine Tai](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/05/tai-says-united-states-will-back-india-southafrica-proposal-waive-ip-rights-trips/id=133224/) was subject to questioning along this very line during a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing. And while Ambassador Tai did not affirmatively state that an IP waiver would be in the future for climate change technology, she surely did not assuage the concerns of interested parties. The United States has historically supported robust IP protection. This support is one reason the United States is the center of biotechnology innovation and leading the fight against COVID-19. However, a brief review of the domestic legislation arguably most relevant to this discussion shows just how far the international campaign against IP rights has eroded our **normative position**. The Clean Air Act, for example, contains a provision allowing for the mandatory licensing of patents covering certain devices for reducing air pollution. Importantly, however, the patent owner is accorded due process and the statute lays out a detailed process regulating the manner in which any such license can be issued, including findings of necessity and that no reasonable alternative method to accomplish the legislated goal exists. Also of critical importance is that the statute requires compensation to the patent holder. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Act contemplates mandatory licensing of patents covering inventions of primary importance in producing or utilizing atomic energy. This statute, too, requires due process, findings of importance to the statutory goals and compensation to the rights holder. A TRIPS IP waiver would operate outside of these types of frameworks. There would be no **due process**, no particularized findings, no **compensation and** no **recourse**. Indeed, the fact that the World Trade Organization (WTO) already has a process under the TRIPS agreement to address public health crises, including the compulsory licensing provisions, with necessary guardrails and compensation, makes quite clear that the waiver would operate as a free for all. Forced Tech Transfer Could Be on The Table When being questioned about the scope of a potential TRIPS IP waiver, Ambassador Tai invoked the proverb “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” While this answer suggests primarily that, in times of famine, the Administration would rather give away other people’s fishing rods than share its own plentiful supply of fish (here: actual COVID-19 vaccine stocks), it is apparent that in Ambassador Tai’s view waiving patent rights alone would not help lower- and middle-income countries produce their own vaccines. Rather, they would need to be taught how to make the vaccines and given the biotech industry’s manufacturing know-how, sensitive cell lines, and proprietary cell culture media in order to do so. In other words, Ambassador Tai acknowledged that the scope of the current TRIPS IP waiver discussions includes the concept of forced tech transfer. In the context of climate change, the idea would be that companies who develop successful methods for producing new **seed technologies and sustainable biomass, reducing greenhouse gases** in manufacturing **and** transportation, **capturing** and sequestering **carbon** in soil and products, and more, **would be required to turn over their proprietary know-how** to global competitors. While it is unclear how this concept would work in practice and under the constitutions of certain countries, the suggestion alone could be devastating **to voluntary international collaborations**. Even if one could assume that the United States could not implement forced tech transfer on its own soil, what about the governments of our international development partners? It is not hard to understand that a U.S.-based company developing climate change technologies would be unenthusiastic about partnering with a company abroad knowing that the foreign country’s government is on track – with the assent of the U.S. government – to change its laws and seize proprietary materials and know-how that had been voluntarily transferred to the local company. Necessary Investment Could Diminish Developing climate change solutions is not an easy endeavor and bad policy positions threaten the likelihood that they will materialize. These products have long lead times from research and development to market introduction, owing not only to a high rate of failure but also rigorous regulatory oversight. Significant investment is required to sustain and drive these challenging and long-enduring endeavors. For example, synthetic biology companies critical to this area of innovation [raised over $1 billion in investment in the second quarter of 2019 alone](https://www.bio.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/Climate%20Report_FINAL.pdf). If investors cannot be confident that IP will be in **place to protect important climate change technologies** after their long road from bench to market, **it is unlikely they will** continue to **invest at** the current and **required levels.**

#### Private sector innovation is key to solve climate change – short term politicking and priority shifts means government can’t solve alone.

Henry 17, Simon. “Climate Change Cannot Be Solved by Governments Alone. How Can the Private Sector Help?” World Economic Forum, 21 Nov. 2017, www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/11/governments-alone-cannot-halt-climate-change-what-can-private-sector-do/.  Programme Director, International Carbon Reduction & Offset Alliance (ICROA) //sid

Climate leadership is also an opportunity for many organizations, and this was the most popular reason for purchasing carbon credits in Ecosystem Marketplace’s [2016 survey of buyers](http://www.forest-trends.org/documents/files/doc_5677.pdf%5Bforest-trends.org%5D). Companies are looking to differentiate from their competitors, and build their brand, by taking a leadership role on climate. Offsetting plays an integral role in delivering this climate leadership status, alongside direct emissions reductions. The survey indicated that companies that included offsetting in their carbon management strategy typically spend about 10 times more on emissions reductions activities than the typical company that doesn’t offset.

Beyond these direct commercial reasons for companies to take voluntary action, there are many broader, societal motivations at play. Climate change is a global, multidecade challenge that needs solutions and input from all stakeholders. It transcends the short-term nature of politics, which will inevitably experience changes in priorities, personnel and knowledge. Because of this, climate change cannot be solved by governments alone. Instead, it needs significant and long-term investment from the private sector. Companies that take a longer-term outlook recognise this and want to contribute to the solution to help secure the viability of their businesses.

#### Warming causes Extinction

Kareiva 18, Peter, and Valerie Carranza. "Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back." Futures 102 (2018): 39-50. (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)//Re-cut by Elmer

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 c**hallenges 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.

## 5

#### Text – the United States ought to

#### anonymously invest $25 billion into 25 production lines dedicated solely to COVID-19 vaccines to boost global vaccine production managed by the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.

#### distribute 8 billion doses of COVID vaccines using an equitable distribution framework prioritizing developing countries in the Global South.

#### The CP solves the entirety of the case and does it faster.

Stankiewicz 21 Mike Stankiewicz 5-6-2021"Opinion: For just $25 billion, the U.S. could jump-start a project to quickly vaccinate the entire world against COVID" <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/for-just-25-billion-the-u-s-could-jump-start-a-project-to-quickly-vaccinate-the-entire-world-against-covid-11614898552> (a press officer in Public Citizen's communication's department, where he focuses on legislative policy and health-orientated advocacy)//Elmer

Despite wealthy countries such as the U.S. ramping up COVID-19 vaccination efforts, **it** still **may** **take years to vaccinate the world**, especially poorer countries, and the economic and humanitarian impacts could be devastating. But **an injection of** **just $25 billion** **into global vaccine production efforts by the U.S.** government **could save millions of lives** and help prevent economic disaster. The most up-to-date numbers paint incredibly different futures between wealthy and low-income countries. At the current rate of vaccination, analysts predict that developing countries, including almost all of Southeast Asia, may not reach meaningful vaccine coverage until 2023. Comparatively, President Joe Biden has promised that the U.S. will have enough vaccine doses to inoculate every adult within the next three months. Increased fatalities And as wealthy countries such as the U.S. are starting to see lower death, transmission and hospitalization rates, low-income countries are experiencing increased hardship and fatalities. Countries such as Hungry are being forced to tighten restrictions as infection rates increase, and deaths in Africa have spiked by 40% in the past month, according to the World Health Organization (WHO). No country can be left behind in this global pandemic, and the U.S. is in a unique position to make sure every country gets the ample amount of vaccines they need. **Public Citizen research has found that just a $25 billion investment in COVID-19 vaccine production by the U.S. government would produce enough vaccine for developing countries, potentially shaving years from the global pandemic**. Public Citizen estimates that **8 billion doses of** National Institutes of Health-**Moderna MRNA**, +1.98% vaccine can be **produced** **for** just over **$3 per dose**. To bolster production and supply the necessary 8 billion doses, it would take **$1.9 billion to fund** the necessary **25 production lines**. Another **$19 billion** would pay **for materials and labor**, and **$3 billion** would **compensate** **Moderna** **for making technology available to manufacturers** in other countries. An additional $500 million would cover costs to staff and run **a rapid-response federal program that provides technical assistance and facilitates technology transfer to manufacturers and works with the WHO’s technology hub.** In total, vaccinating the world would cost less than 1.4% the total of Biden’s $1.9 trillion COVID relief plan. But such a program also needs to be properly managed to be successful. To help facilitate these efforts, the Biden administration should also **designate** the government’s Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (**BARDA**) **to lead** the world-wide **vaccine manufacturing effort**. BARDA has the **necessary experience to coordinate** **an initiative of this scale** with the WHO, building on its partnership to build pandemic flu manufacturing capacity in developing countries after the bird-flu scare of 2006. Widespread vaccines would help U.S. economy These efforts would dramatically increase access to vaccines in developing countries and speed up global vaccination by years, saving countless lives. But allowing the current vaccine supply crisis to continue is not just inhumane, it is also not in our own economic interest to do so.

## 6

#### Infrastructure passes now due to Biden and Pelosi involvement – Biden PC and tight timetables makes the margin for error literally ZERO

Elliott 9-16 (Philip Elliott is a Washington Correspondent for TIME. Before joining TIME in early 2015, he spent almost a decade at The Associated Press, where he covered politics, campaign finance, education and the White House. He is a graduate of the E.W. Scripps School of Journalism at Ohio University, September 16, 2021, accessed on 9-17-2021, Time, "Democrats Face a Grueling Two Weeks as Infighting Erupts Over Infrastructure", https://time.com/6098810/house-democrats-reconciliation/)//babcii

House Democrats yesterday finished penning a 2,600-page bill that **finally outlines the specifics** of their ambitious “soft” infrastructure plan that won’t attract a single Republican vote. But no one was really rushing to Schneider’s for bottles of bubbly. For a party ready to spend $3.5 trillion to fund its social policy agenda, there were plenty of glum faces on Capitol Hill. In fact, one key piece of the legislation—a deal that would finally let Medicare negotiate lower prices with drug companies—fell apart in the Energy and Commerce Committee when three Democrats voted against it. It found resurrection a short time later when Leadership aides literally plucked it from the Energy and Commerce team and delivered it to the Ways and Means Committee for its approval instead. Even there, though, one Democrat voted against it, saying the threat it posed to pharmaceutical companies’ profits would doom it in the Senate. “Every moment we spend debating provisions that will never become law is a moment wasted and will delay much-needed assistance to the American people,” Rep. Stephanie Murphy of Florida later argued. Put another way? Brace **for some nasty politics** over the next two weeks as House Speaker Nancy Pelosi tries to get this bill to a vote before the budget year ends on Sept. 30. And those 2,600 pages had better be recyclable. Democrats can **only afford three defectors** if they want to usher this bill into law, **and they’re perilously close to failure**. So far, five centrist Democrats in the House have said they prefer a scaled-back version of the Medicare component. But if Pelosi gives the five centrists that win, she risks losing the support of progressives who are already sour that things like a punitive wealth tax and the end to tax loopholes aren’t present in the current version of the bill. As it stands now, letting Medicare negotiate drug prices would save the government about $500 billion over the next decade. The scaled-back version doesn’t have an official cost, but a very similar version got its score in the Senate last year: roughly $100 billion in savings. Because Democrats are using a budgeting loophole to help them avoid a filibuster and pass this with bare majorities, that $400 billion gap matters a lot more than on most bills. Scaling back the Medicare savings means they would also have to scale back their overall spending on the bill—a big line in the sand for progressives who say they’ve already compromised too much. All of this, of course, comes as President Joe Biden and his top aides in the White House have been trying to get Senate **centrists onboard**. Just yesterday, he **met separately with Sens. Kyrsten Sinema and Joe Manchin**, fellow Democrats who have expressed worries about the $3.5 trillion price tag but have been vague about what exactly they want to cut back on. With the Senate evenly divided at 50-50, and Vice President Kamala Harris in position to break the ties to Democrats’ victories, any shenanigans from those two independent thinkers scrambles the whole package. Oh, and that other bipartisan infrastructure plan that carries $550 billion in new spending? It’s still sitting on the shelf in the House. Pelosi said she’d bring it to the floor only when the bigger—and entirely partisan—bill was ready. And there’s plenty of grumbling about that package, too. If this is all beginning to sound like a scratched record that keeps repeating, it’s because this has become something of a pattern here in Washington. Things look pretty grim for legislation in town these days, despite Democrats controlling the House, the Senate and the White House. Their margin for error **is literally zero**, and so hiccups from a half-dozen centrists can forewarn a doomed agenda. So far, Pelosi has been a master of holding the line on crucial votes and has managed to maneuver her team to victories, including on an earlier pandemic relief package that passed with only Democratic votes. Now she’s trying again, but the clock is ticking, and $3.5 trillion is an eye-popping sum of money that rivals the spending the United States unleashed to close out World War II.

#### Attacks on Pharmaceutical Profits triggers Mod Dem Backlash – it disrupts unity.

Cohen 9-6 Joshua Cohen 9-6-2021 "Democrats’ Plans To Introduce Prescription Drug Pricing Reform Face Formidable Obstacles" <https://www.forbes.com/sites/joshuacohen/2021/09/06/democrats-plans-to-introduce-prescription-drug-pricing-reform-face-obstacles/?sh=37a269917395> (independent healthcare analyst with over 22 years of experience analyzing healthcare and pharmaceuticals.)//Elmer

There’s considerable uncertainty regarding passage with a simple majority of the 2021 massive budget reconciliation bill. Last week, Senator Joe Manchin called on Democrats to pause pushing forward the budget reconciliation bill. If Manchin winds up saying no to the bill, this would scuttle it as the Democrats can’t afford to lose a single Senator. And, there’s speculation that provisions to reduce prescription drug prices may be watered down and not incorporate international price referencing. Additionally, reduced prices derived through Medicare negotiation may not be able to be applied to those with employer-based coverage. While the progressive wing of the Democratic Party supports drug pricing reform, **several key centrist Democrats** in both the House and Senate appear to be **uncomfortable** **with** particular aspects of the budget reconciliation bill, including a potential deal-breaker, namely the potential **negative impact of drug price controls on the domestic pharmaceutical industry**, as well as long-term patient access to new drugs. A paper released in 2019 by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found that the proposed legislation, H.R. 3, would reduce global revenue for new drugs by 19%, leading to 8 fewer drugs approved in the U.S. between 2020 and 2029, and 30 fewer drugs over the next decade. And, a new report from the CBO reinforces the message that drug pricing legislation under consideration in Congress could lead to fewer new drugs being developed and launched. **Intense lobbying efforts from biopharmaceutical industry groups** **are underway**, **warning of** what they deem are **harms from price controls in** the form of diminished patient **access to new innovations**. The argument, based in part on assumptions and modeling included in the CBO reports, asserts that price controls would dampen investment critical to the biopharmaceutical industry’s pipeline of drugs and biologics. **This** won’t sway most Democrats, but has been a traditional talking point in the Republican Party for decades, and **may convince some centrist Democrats to withdraw backing** of provisions **that** in their eyes **stymie pharmaceutical innovation.** If the budget reconciliation bill would fail to garner a majority, a pared down version of H.R. 3, or perhaps a new bill altogether, with Senator Wyden spearheading the effort, could eventually land in the Senate. But, a similar set of provisos would apply, as majority support in both chambers would be far from a sure thing. In brief, Democrats’ plans at both the executive and legislative branch levels to introduce prescription **drug pricing reform** **encounter challenges** which may prevent impactful modifications from taking place.

#### Sinema specifically jumps Ship.

Hancock and Lucas 20 Jay Hancock and Elizabeth Lucas 5-29-2020 "A Senator From Arizona Emerges As A Pharma Favorite" <https://khn.org/news/a-senator-from-arizona-emerges-as-a-pharma-favorite/> (Senior Correspondent, joined KHN in 2012 from The Baltimore Sun, where he wrote a column on business and finance. Previously he covered the State Department and the economics beat for The Sun and health care for The Virginian-Pilot of Norfolk and the Daily Press of Newport News. He has a bachelor’s degree from Colgate University and a master’s in journalism from Northwestern University.)//Elmer

Sen. Kyrsten **Sinema formed** a **congressional caucus to raise** “**awareness of the benefits of personalized medicine**” in February. Soon after that, employees of **pharmaceutical companies** **donated** $35,000 to her campaign committee. Amgen gave $5,000. So did Genentech and Merck. Sanofi, Pfizer and Eli Lilly all gave $2,500. Each of those companies has invested heavily in personalized medicine, which promises individually tailored drugs that can cost a patient hundreds of thousands of dollars. **Sinema** is a first-term Democrat from Arizona but has nonetheless **emerged as a pharma favorite in Congress** as the industry steers through a new political and economic landscape formed by the coronavirus. She is a **leading recipient of pharma campaign cash** even though she’s not up for reelection until 2024 and lacks major committee or subcommittee leadership posts. For the 2019-20 election cycle through March, political action committees run by employees of drug companies and their trade groups gave her $98,500 in campaign funds, Kaiser Health News’ Pharma Cash to Congress database shows. That stands out in a Congress in which a third of the members got no pharma cash for the period and half of those who did got $10,000 or less. The contributions give companies a chance to cultivate Sinema as she restocks from a brutal 2018 election victory that cost nearly $25 million. Altogether, pharma PACs have so far given $9.2 million to congressional campaign chests in this cycle, compared with $9.4 million at this point in the 2017-18 period, a sustained surge as the industry has responded to complaints about soaring prices. Sinema’s pharma haul was twice that of Sen. Susan Collins of Maine, considered one of the most vulnerable Republicans in November, and approached that of fellow Democrat Steny Hoyer, the powerful House majority leader from Maryland. It all adds up to **a bet by drug companies that** the 43-year-old **Sinema**, first elected to the Senate in 2018, **will** gain influence in coming years and **serve as an industry ally** in a party that also includes many lawmakers harshly critical of high drug prices and the companies that set them.

#### Pharma backlashes to the Plan – they’re aggressive lobbyists and will do anything to preserve patent rights.

* Turns Case – Waters down the Plan due to lobbying
* Optional Card – still thinking on if its necessary [note from Elmer]

Huetteman 19 Emmarie Huetteman 2-26-2019 “Senators Who Led Pharma-Friendly Patent Reform Also Prime Targets For Pharma Cash” <https://khn.org/news/senators-who-led-pharma-friendly-patent-reform-also-prime-targets-for-pharma-cash/> (former NYT Congressional correspondent with an MA in public affairs reporting from Northwestern University’s Medill School)//Elmer

Early last year, as lawmakers vowed to curb rising drug prices, Sen. Thom Tillis was named chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee’s subcommittee on intellectual property rights, a committee that had not met since 2007. As the new gatekeeper for laws and oversight of the nation’s patent system, the North Carolina Republican signaled he was determined to make it easier for American businesses to benefit from it — a welcome message to the drugmakers who already leverage patents to block competitors and keep prices high. Less than three weeks after introducing a bill that would make it harder for generic drugmakers to compete with patent-holding drugmakers, Tillis opened the subcommittee’s first meeting on Feb. 26, 2019, with his own vow. “From the United States Patent and Trademark Office to the State Department’s Office of Intellectual Property Enforcement, no department or bureau is too big or too small for this subcommittee to take interest,” he said. “And we will.” In the months that followed, tens of thousands of dollars flowed from pharmaceutical companies toward his campaign, as well as to the campaigns of other subcommittee members — including some who promised to stop drugmakers from playing money-making games with the patent system, like Sen. John Cornyn (R-Texas). Tillis received more than $156,000 from political action committees tied to drug manufacturers in 2019, more than any other member of Congress, a new analysis of KHN’s Pharma Cash to Congress database shows. Sen. Chris Coons (D-Del.), the top Democrat on the subcommittee who worked side by side with Tillis, received more than $124,000 in drugmaker contributions last year, making him the No. 3 recipient in Congress. No. 2 was Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.), who took in about $139,000. As the Senate majority leader, he controls what legislation gets voted on by the Senate. Neither Tillis nor Coons sits on the Senate committees that introduced legislation last year to lower drug prices through methods like capping price increases to the rate of inflation. Of the four senators who drafted those bills, none received more than $76,000 from drug manufacturers in 2019. Tillis and Coons spent much of last year working on significant legislation that would expand the range of items eligible to be patented — a change that some experts say would make it easier for companies developing medical tests and treatments to own things that aren’t traditionally inventions, like genetic code. They have not yet officially introduced a bill. As obscure as patents might seem in an era of public **outrage** **over** drug prices, the fact that **drugmakers** gave most **to** the **lawmakers working to change the patent system** belies how important securing **the exclusive right to market a drug, and keep competitors at bay, is to their bottom line**. “**Pharma will fight to the death to preserve patent rights**,” said Robin Feldman, a professor at the UC Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco who is an expert in intellectual property rights and drug pricing. “Strong patent rights are central to the games drug companies play to extend their monopolies and keep prices high.” Campaign contributions, closely tracked by the Federal Election Commission, are among the few windows into how much money flows from the political groups of drugmakers and other companies to the lawmakers and their campaigns. Private companies generally give money to members of Congress to encourage them to listen to the companies, typically through lobbyists, whose activities are difficult to track. They may also communicate through so-called dark money groups, which are not required to report who gives them money. Over the past 10 years, the **pharmaceutical industry** has **spent** about $**233 million per year on lobbying**, according to a new study published in JAMA Internal Medicine. That is more than any other industry, including the oil and gas industry. Why Patents Matter Developing and testing a new drug, and gaining approval from the Food and Drug Administration, can take years and cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Drugmakers are generally granted a six- or seven-year exclusivity period to recoup their investments. But drugmakers have found ways to extend that period of exclusivity, sometimes accumulating hundreds of patents on the same drug and blocking competition for decades. One method is to patent many inventions beyond a drug’s active ingredient, such as patenting the injection device that administers the drug. Keeping that arrangement intact, or expanding what can be patented, is where lawmakers come in. Lawmakers Dig In Tillis’ home state of North Carolina is also home to three major research universities and, not coincidentally, multiple drugmakers’ headquarters, factories and other facilities. From his swearing-in in 2015 to the end of 2018, Tillis received about $160,000 from drugmakers based there or beyond. He almost matched that four-year total in 2019 alone, in the midst of a difficult reelection campaign to be decided this fall. He has raised nearly $10 million for his campaign, with lobbyists among his biggest contributors, according to OpenSecrets. Daniel Keylin, a spokesperson for Tillis, said Tillis and Coons, the subcommittee’s top Democrat, are working to overhaul the country’s “antiquated intellectual property laws.” Keylin said the bipartisan effort protects the development and access to affordable, lifesaving medication for patients,” adding: “No contribution has any impact on how [Tillis] votes or legislates.” Tillis signaled his openness to the drug industry early on. The day before being named chairman, he reintroduced a bill that would limit the options generic drugmakers have to challenge allegedly invalid patents, effectively helping brand-name drugmakers protect their monopolies. Former Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), whose warm relationship with the drug industry was well-known, had introduced the legislation, the Hatch-Waxman Integrity Act, just days before his retirement in 2018. At his subcommittee’s first hearing, Tillis said the members would rely on testimony from private businesses to guide them. He promised to hold hearings on patent eligibility standards and “reforms to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.” In practice, the Hatch-Waxman Integrity Act would require generics makers challenging another drugmaker’s patent to either take their claim to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, which acts as a sort of cheaper, faster quality check to catch bad patents, or file a lawsuit. A study released last year found that, since Congress created the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in 2011, it has narrowed or overturned about 51% of the drugmaker patents that generics makers have challenged. Feldman said the drug industry “went berserk” over the number of patents the board changed and has been eager to limit use of the board as much as possible. Patent reviewers are often stretched thin and sometimes make mistakes, said Aaron Kesselheim, a Harvard Medical School professor who is an expert in intellectual property rights and drug development. Limiting the ways to challenge patents, as Tillis’ bill would, does not strengthen the patent system, he said. “You want overlapping oversight for a system that is as important and fundamental as this system is,” he said. As promised, Tillis and Coons also spent much of the year working on so-called Section 101 reform regarding what is eligible to be patented — “a very major change” that “would overturn more than a century of Supreme Court law,” Feldman said. Sean Coit, Coons’ spokesperson, said lowering drug prices is one of the senator’s top priorities and pointed to Coon’s support for legislation the pharmaceutical industry opposes. “One of the reasons Senator Coons is leading efforts in Congress to fix our broken patent system is so that life-saving medicines can actually be developed and produced at affordable prices for every American,” Coit wrote in an email, adding that “his work on Section 101 reform has brought together advocates from across the spectrum, including academics and health experts.” In August, when much of Capitol Hill had emptied for summer recess, Tillis and Coons held closed-door meetings to preview their legislation to stakeholders, including the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, or PhRMA, the brand-name drug industry’s lobbying group. “We regularly engage with members of Congress in both parties to advance practical policy solutions that will lower medicine costs for patients,” said Holly Campbell, a PhRMA spokesperson. Neither proposal has received a public hearing. In the 30 days before Tillis and Coons were named leaders of the revived subcommittee, drug manufacturers gave them $21,000 from their political action committees. In the 30 days following that first hearing, Tillis and Coons received $60,000. Among their donors were PhRMA; the Biotechnology Innovation Organization, the biotech lobbying group; and five of the seven drugmakers whose executives — as Tillis laid out a pharma-friendly agenda for his new subcommittee — were getting chewed out by senators in a different hearing room over patent abuse. Cornyn Goes After Patent Abuse Richard Gonzalez, chief executive of AbbVie Inc., the company known for its top-selling drug, Humira, had spent the morning sitting stone-faced before the Senate Finance Committee as, one after another, senators excoriated him and six other executives of brand-name drug manufacturers over how they price their products. Cornyn brought up AbbVie’s more than 130 patents on Humira. Hadn’t the company blocked its competition? Cornyn asked Gonzalez, who carefully explained how AbbVie’s lawsuit against a generics competitor and subsequent licensing deal was not what he would describe as anti-competitive behavior. “I realize it may not be popular,” Gonzalez said. “But I think it is a reasonable balance.” A minute later, Cornyn turned to Sen. Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa), who, like Cornyn, was also a member of the revived intellectual property subcommittee. This is worth looking into with “our Judiciary Committee authorities as well,” Cornyn said, effectively threatening legislation on patent abuse. The next day, Mylan, one of the largest producers of generic drugs, gave Cornyn $5,000, FEC records show. The company had not donated to Cornyn in years. By midsummer, every drug company that sent an executive to that hearing had given money to Cornyn, including AbbVie. Cornyn, who faces perhaps the most difficult reelection fight of his career this fall, ranks No. 6 among members of Congress in drugmaker PAC contributions last year, KHN’s analysis shows. He received about $104,000. Cornyn has received about $708,500 from drugmakers since 2007, KHN’s database shows. According to OpenSecrets, he has raised more than $17 million for this year’s reelection campaign. Cornyn’s office declined to comment. On May 9, Cornyn and Sen. Richard Blumenthal (D-Conn.) introduced the **Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act,** which proposed to define two tactics used by drug companies to make it easier for the Federal Trade Commission to **prosecute** them: “**product-hopping**,” when drugmakers withdraw older versions of their drugs from the market to push patients toward newer, more expensive ones, and “**patent-thicketing**,” when drugmakers amass a series of patents to drag out their exclusivity and slow rival generics makers, who must challenge those patents to enter the market once the initial exclusivity ends. **PhRMA opposed the bill.** **The next day, it gave Cornyn $1,000**. Cornyn and Blumenthal’s bill would have been “very tough on the techniques that pharmaceutical companies use to extend patent protections and to keep prices high,” Feldman said. “The **pharmaceutical industry lobbied tooth and nail against it**,” she said. “And **when the bill finally came** out of committee, the strongest provisions — the **patent-thicketing provisions — had been stripped**.” In the months after the bill cleared committee and waited to be taken up by the Senate, Cornyn blamed Senate Democrats for blocking the bill while trying to secure votes on legislation with more direct controls on drug prices. The Senate has not voted on the bill.

#### They choose Infrastructure as backlash – the bill costs Pharma millions – lobbyists can derail the Agenda.

Brennan 8-2 Zachary Brennan 8-2-2021 "How the biopharma industry is helping to pay for the bipartisan infrastructure bill" <https://endpts.com/how-the-biopharma-industry-is-helping-to-pay-for-the-bipartisan-infrastructure-bill/> (Senior Editor at Endpoint News)//Elmer

Senators on Sunday finalized the text of **a massive, bipartisan infrastructure bill** that contains little **that might** **impact the biopharma industry** other than two ways the legislators are planning to pay for the $1.2 trillion deal. On the one hand, senators are **seeking to** further **delay** a **Trump-era Medicare** Part D **rule** **related to drug rebates**, this time until 2026. Senators claim the rule could end up saving about $49 billion (and that number increased this week to $51 billion), but the PBM industry has attacked it as it would remove rebates from a safe harbor that provides protection from federal anti-kickback laws. The **pharmaceutical industry**, however, is in favor of the rule and **opposes this latest delay** as it continues to point its finger at the PBM industry for the rising cost of out-of-pocket expenses. Debra DeShong, EVP of public affairs at PhRMA, said via email: Despite railing against high drug costs on the campaign trail, lawmakers are threatening to gut a rule that would provide patients meaningful relief at the pharmacy. If it is included in the infrastructure package, this proposal will provide health insurers and drug middlemen a windfall and turn Medicare into a piggybank to fund projects that have nothing to do with lowering out-of-pocket costs for medicines. This would be an unconscionable move that robs patients of the prescription drug savings they deserve to help fill potholes and fund other infrastructure projects. The **other provision** **in the infrastructure bill**, which is estimated to save about $3 billion, **would save money for Medicare** **on discarded medications** from large, single-use drug vials. **Manufacturers will be required to pay refunds** for such discarded drugs, and each manufacturer will be subject to periodic audits on the refunds issued. If manufacturers don’t comply, HHS can fine them the refund amount that they would have paid plus 25%. Drugs that will be excluded from these refund payments include radiopharmaceuticals or imaging agents, as well as those that require filtration during the drug preparation process. So do these two pay-fors mean that the pharma industry is getting off without any serious drug pricing reforms? Not quite, according to Alex Lawson, executive director of Social Security Works. Lawson told Endpoints News in an interview that he still fully expects major drug pricing reforms to make their way through Congress between now and the end of September as Sen. Ron Wyden (D-OR) refines his plan, part of an early fall spending package. Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer has promised both the infrastructure and spending package will pass before the Senate leaves for August recess. At the very least in terms of drug pricing provisions, expect to see a combination of the Wyden bill he co-wrote with Sen. Chuck Grassley (R-IA) last year, alongside further Medicare negotiations, Lawson said. “Talk is still optimistic,” Lawson said on the prospects of a drug pricing deal getting done, while noting that **pharmaceutical** company **lobbyists** are **swarming Capitol Hill** at the moment because of **not just drug pricing plans**, but **tax provisions** and the **TRIPS waiver** that the biopharma industry is worried about. “These are **challenges to their entire existence**, **so they’re willing to protect them at any cost**,” Lawson said, noting the target for drug pricing is about $500 billion in savings. As the House has jetted off to enjoy what might be an abbreviated summer recess, the Senate has just this week to get its work done, unless its recess is cut short too. “There’s a **real possibility** that **the whole thing blows up** and we get nothing on either side,” Lawson said.

#### Infrastructure reform solves Existential Climate Change – it results in spill-over.

USA Today 7-20 7-20-2021 "Climate change is at 'code red' status for the planet, and inaction is no longer an option" <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/todaysdebate/2021/07/20/climate-change-biden-infrastructure-bill-good-start/7877118002/> //Elmer

**Not long ago**, **climate change** for many Americans **was** like **a distant bell**. News of starving polar bears or melting glaciers was tragic and disturbing, but other worldly. Not any more. **Top climate scientists** from around the world **warned of a "code red for humanity**" in a report issued Monday that says severe, human-caused global warming is become unassailable. Proof of the findings by the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is a now a factor of daily life. Due to **intense heat waves and drought**, 107 wildfires – including the largest ever in California – are now raging across the West, consuming 2.3 million acres. Earlier this summer, hundreds of people died in unprecedented triple-digit heat in Oregon, Washington and western Canada, when a "heat dome" of enormous proportions settled over the region for days. Some victims brought by stretcher into crowded hospital wards had body temperatures so high, their nervous systems had shut down. People collapsed trying to make their way to cooling shelters. Heat-trapping greenhouse gases Scientists say the event was almost **certainly made worse and more intransigent by human-caused climate change**. They attribute it to a combination of warming Arctic temperatures and a growing accumulation of heat-trapping greenhouse gases caused by the burning of fossil fuels. The **consequences of** what mankind has done to the atmo**sphere are now inescapable**. Periods of **extreme heat** are projected to **double** in the lower 48 states by 2100. **Heat deaths** are far **outpacing every other form of weather killer** in a 30-year average. A **persistent megadrought** in America's West continues to create tinder-dry conditions that augur another devastating wildfire season. And scientists say **warming oceans** are **fueling** ever **more powerful storms**, evidenced by Elsa and the early arrival of hurricane season this year. Increasingly severe weather is causing an estimated $100 billion in damage to the United States every year. "It is honestly surreal to see your projections manifesting themselves in real time, with all the suffering that accompanies them. It is heartbreaking," said climate scientist Katharine Hayhoe. **Rising seas** from global warming Investigators are still trying to determine what led to the collapse of a Miami-area condominium that left more than 100 dead or missing. But one concerning factor is the corrosive effect on reinforced steel structures of encroaching saltwater, made worse in Florida by a foot of rising seas from global warming since the 1900s. The clock is ticking for planet Earth. While the U.N. report concludes some level of severe climate change is now unavoidable, there is still a window of time when far more catastrophic events can be mitigated. But mankind must act soon to curb the release of heat-trapping gases. Global **temperature** has **risen** nearly **2 degrees** Fahrenheit since the pre-industrial era of the late 19th century. Scientists warn that in a decade, it could surpass a **2.7**-degree increase. That's **enough** warming **to cause catastrophic climate changes**. After a brief decline in global greenhouse gas emissions during the pandemic, pollution is on the rise. Years that could have been devoted to addressing the crisis were wasted during a feckless period of inaction by the Trump administration. Congress must act Joe Biden won the presidency promising broad new policies to cut America's greenhouse gas emissions. But Congress needs to act on those ideas this year. Democrats cannot risk losing narrow control of one or both chambers of Congress in the 2022 elections to a Republican Party too long resistant to meaningful action on the climate. So what's at issue? A trillion dollar **infrastructure bill** negotiated between Biden and a group of centrist senators (including 10 Republicans) is a start. In addition to repairing bridges, roads and rails, it would **improve access** by the nation's power infrastructure **to renewable energy sources,** **cap millions of abandoned oil and gas wells spewing greenhouse gases**, **and harden structures against climate change**. It also **offers tax credits for** the **purchase of electric vehicles** and funds the construction of charging stations. (**The nation's largest source of climate pollution are gas-powered vehicles**.) Senate approval could come very soon. Much **more is needed** if the nation is going to reach Biden's necessary goal of cutting U.S. climate pollution in half from 2005 levels by 2030. His ideas worth considering include a federal clean electricity standard for utilities, federal investments and tax credits to promote renewable energy, and tens of billions of dollars in clean energy research and development, including into ways of extracting greenhouse gases from the skies. Another idea worth considering is a fully refundable carbon tax. **The vehicle** for these additional proposals **would be a second infrastructure bill**. And if Republicans balk at the cost of such vital investment, Biden is rightly proposing to pass this package through a process known as budget reconciliation, which allows bills to clear the Senate with a simple majority vote. These are drastic legislative steps. But drastic times call for them. And when Biden attends a U.N. climate conference in November, he can use American progress on climate change as a mean of persuading others to follow our lead. Further delay is not an option.

## Case

### Underview

#### Reasonablility -

### Plan

#### WTO collapse solves extinction

Hilary 15 John Hilary 2015 “Want to know how to really tackle climate change? Pull the plug on the World Trade Organisation” <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/want-to-know-how-to-really-tackle-climate-change-pull-the-plug-on-the-world-trade-organisation-a6774391.html> (Executive Director, War on Want)//Elmer

Yet this grandiose plan soon fell victim to its own ambition. The WTO’s first summit after the launch of the Doha Round collapsed in acrimonious failure. The next was marked by pitched battles in the streets of Hong Kong as riot police fought Asian farmers desperately trying to save their livelihoods from the WTO’s free trade agenda. The WTO slipped into a coma. Government ministers must decide this week whether to turn off its life support. The answer is surely yes. It was the WTO’s poisonous cocktail of trade expansion and market deregulation that led to the economic crisis of 2008. Years of export-led growth resulted in a crisis of overproduction that could only be sustained with mountains of debt. The parallel deregulation of financial services meant that this debt soon turned out to be toxic, and the world’s banking system went into freefall. Nor is the WTO fit for purpose on ecological grounds. If last week’s climate talks in Paris taught us anything, it is that we must rethink the model of ever-expanding production and consumption in order to avoid planetary meltdown. Global capitalism may need limitless expansion in order to survive, but the planet is already at the very limits of what it can take. The choice is ours. Worst of all, it is the WTO’s ideology of unrestricted trade and corporate domination that lies behind all the bilateral trade deals that are proliferating at the moment, including the infamous Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). We need a radically different model of regulated trade and controlled investment if we are to have any chance of breaking the cycle of economic and ecological crisis. For the planet to survive, the WTO must die.

#### The Hamaan Impact:

#### 1] No Brink Scenario – no explanations of conflicts/tensions that are escalating now.

#### 2] China thumps Compliance – they’ll never listen.

Webster 14, Timothy. "Paper compliance: How China implements WTO decisions." Mich. J. Int'l L. 35 (2014): 525. (Director of East Asian Legal Studies & Assistant Professor of Law, Case Western Reserve University)//Elmer

Since the number of WTO cases involving China is small, certitude about China's future conduct in the DSB would be inapt. But certain patterns are clear. First, in the majority of cases, China has revised its legal and regulatory systems to comply with the DSB rulings. It has done so typically within the reasonable period of time in which it agreed to do so and has accumulated a strong record in terms of the quality of its implementation. Moreover, as of July 2013, no Chi-nese case has gone into compliance proceedings, wherein an arbitration panel determines the costs of one country's non-compliance to other WTO members. This is a significant difference from other major trading partners, such as the United States, E.U., and Japan, all of which have been respondents in compliance proceedings. n256 Some of these cases have dragged on for more than a decade, indicating a resistance to WTO rulings far and above anything that China has exhibited. Second, **China has found ways to resist WTO rulings** and norms. Inconsistent regulations remain in effect. In the three cases discussed above - DS 362 (intellectual property enforcement), DS 363 (trading rights for publications) DS 373 (financial information services) - inconsistent regulations either continue in effect or were revised so as not to ef-fectuate [\*573] the purpose of the ruling. This lacuna could be a function of institutional capacity. China's capa-cious bureaucratic institutions produce reams of regulations; it is unclear whether many of them keep close tabs on the various regulations they produce, and quite definite that some of them have not repealed regulations found to be in-consistent. Or there may be a more sinister explanation: **China wants to keep the inconsistent regulations** in place, and understands that its regulatory maze may be **too labyrinthine for** other **WTO** members **to navigate**.

Whether by design or neglect, a number of inconsistent regulations continue to plague China's compliance record. Moreover, local and provincial-level regulations often amplify the effects of inconsistent national regulations. In cases such as DS 363 and DS 373, lower-level government agencies have promulgated policies that reference regulations that were either revoked or found inconsistent. This means that WTO-inconsistent regulations will cast a regulatory afterglow at various levels of the Chinese legal system. The most striking case of non-compliance, so far, has been the trading rights case (DS 363). The revisions suggest-ed by the DSB challenged China's censorship regime and long-held monopoly on cultural information. Not only did China not comply within a reasonable period of time, but it also left in place several regulations that the DSB deemed inconsistent with WTO disciplines. This suggests that, in particularly sensitive areas, China will not fulfill its implemen-tation obligations. **As China continues to gain experience with WTO litigation**, **instances of non-implementation are likely to increase**. China has, in essence, learned that it can "get away" without fully complying with DSB rulings and recommendations. Indeed, as noted above, two recent rulings show just how far China is willing to push the implemen-tation envelope. Third, reforming laws in China means less than it would in Western liberal democracies with robust legal institu-tions. One-party rule, coupled with a unitary governance structure, allow the party-state to control the passage of laws and regulations, dictate revisions to the domestic legal environment, and coordinate changes with a maximum of speed and minimum of institutional friction. **China** has tinkered with the literal letter of its law, but it **continues** to produce **a whole range of programs that violate WTO** principles. **It is** perhaps **unrealistic to think the DSB can induce compliance** more broadly, that is, outside of the regulation challenged. But it is doubtful that China's domestication of DSB rulings has meaningfully influenced the development of its political economy. Many basic norms - market capitalism, dereg-ulation, strong protection of intellectual property, limits on subsidies - remain alien to China. Fourth, many WTO violations take place in the interstices of law, areas where government officials exercise discre-tion: whether or not to register a foreign company, to issue it a business license, or to prosecute someone for IP theft. Likewise, **China distributes trade regulations to** governmental **agencies as "internal guidance"** (neibu cankao) that should be published under China's WTO transparency obligations, but in fact [\*574] never are. n257 The dispute set-tlement system provides a very rough tool by which to reshape a member's domestic legal system and to monitor its implementation of WTO commitments. A range of violations takes place, either below the radar or without meaningful recourse for investors or manufacturers outside of China. Finally, China deploys the tactical features of the dispute settlement system to buffer the ruling's impact. China settles "easy" cases early and prolongs decisions that seriously disrupt its political system, harm core economic interests, or require significant internal reform to implement. Like any other national actor, China seeks to maximize its interests and minimize disruptions that international law and institutions may inflict upon its domestic legal and regulatory sys-tems.

### Advantage

#### 1] Non-Unique Status Quo solves it – Biden cranked up Vaccine Diplomacy in the wake of China’s Failures – this also answers their China Rise U/Q

Wee and Lee 8-20 Sui-Lee Wee and Steven Lee Myers 8-20-2021 "As Chinese Vaccines Stumble, U.S. Finds New Opening in Asia" https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/20/business/economy/china-vaccine-us-covid-diplomacy.html (Sui-Lee Wee is a China correspondent for The New York Times. She was part of the team that won the 2021 Pulitzer in public service for coverage of the coronavirus pandemic)//Elmer

SINGAPORE — The arrival of the **Chinese vaccines** was supposed to help stop the spread of the coronavirus in Southeast Asia. Instead, **countries** across the region are **quickly turning elsewhere** to look for shots. Residents in Thailand vaccinated with one dose of China’s Sinovac are now given the AstraZeneca shot three to four weeks later. In Indonesia, officials are administering the Moderna vaccine as a booster to health care workers who had received two doses of Sinovac. Malaysia’s health minister said the country would stop using Sinovac once its supply ran out. Even Cambodia, one of China’s strongest allies, has started using AstraZeneca as a booster for its frontline workers who had taken the Chinese vaccines. Few places benefited from China’s vaccine diplomacy as much as Southeast Asia, a region of more than 650 million that has struggled to secure doses from Western drugmakers. Several of these countries have recorded some of the fastest-growing number of cases in the world, underscoring the desperate need for inoculations. China, eager to build good will, stepped in, promising to provide more than 255 million doses, according to Bridge Consulting, a Beijing-based research company. Half a year in, however, that campaign has lost some of its luster. Officials in several countries have raised doubts about the efficacy of Chinese vaccines, especially against the more transmissible Delta variant. Indonesia, which was early to accept Chinese shots, was recently the epicenter of the virus. Others have complained about the conditions that accompanied Chinese donations or sales. The setback to China’s vaccine campaign has created a diplomatic opening for the United States when relations between the two countries are increasingly fraught, in part because of the coronavirus. China has criticized the American handling of the crisis at home and even claimed, with no evidence, that the pandemic originated in a military lab at Fort Detrick, Md., not in Wuhan, where the first cases emerged in late 2019. **As more countries turn away from Chinese shots**, **vaccine aid from the U**nited **S**tates **offers** an **opportunity to restore relations** **in a region that** American officials **have** mostly **ignored for years while China extended its influence**. The **Biden** administration has **dispatched** a crowd of **senior officials,** including Vice President Kamala Harris, who is scheduled to arrive on Sunday to visit Singapore and Vietnam. It has **also**, at last, **made its own vaccine pledges to Southeast Asia**, **emphasizing** that the **American contribution of** roughly **23 million shots** as of this week **comes with “no strings attached,”** an implicit reference to China. **Several countries** in the region have been **eager to receive** the **more effective, Western doses.** Although they remain far outnumbered by Chinese shots, they present an attractive alternative. China’s “early head-start advantage has lost its magic already,” said Hoang Thi Ha, a researcher with the Asean Studies center of the ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute in Singapore. For most of the year, many developing countries in Southeast Asia did not have much of a choice when it came to vaccines. They struggled to acquire doses, many of which were being made by richer nations that have been accused of hoarding them. China sought to fill those needs. The country’s foreign minister, Wang Yi, traveled through the region in January, promising to help fight the pandemic. In April, he declared that Southeast Asia was a priority for Beijing. About a third of the 33 million doses that China has distributed free worldwide were sent to the region, according to the figures provided by Bridge Consulting. Much of Beijing’s focus has been directed at the more populous countries, such as Indonesia and the Philippines, and its longstanding allies like Cambodia and Laos. Indonesia was China’s biggest customer in the region, buying 125 million doses from Sinovac. The Philippines obtained 25 million Sinovac shots after the president, Rodrigo Duterte, said he had turned to Xi Jinping, China’s top leader, for help. Cambodia received more than 2.2 million of China’s Sinopharm doses. It has inoculated roughly 41 percent of its population, achieving the second-highest vaccination rate in the region, after Singapore. Then, signs started emerging that the Chinese vaccines were not as effective as hoped. Indonesia found that 10 percent of its health care workers had become infected with Covid-19 as of July, despite being fully vaccinated with the Sinovac shot, according to the Indonesian Hospital Association. In July, a virologist at Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok said a study of people who had received two doses of the Sinovac vaccine showed that their level of antibodies, 70 percent, was “barely efficacious” against the Alpha variant of the coronavirus, first detected in Britain, or against the Delta variant, first detected in India. The governments in both Indonesia and Thailand decided that they had to make a switch to other vaccines, like those provided by the United States, Britain and Russia. “Now that they have more choices, they can make other decisions,” said Nadège Rolland, senior fellow at the National Bureau of Asian Research in Washington. “I don’t think it’s politically motivated. I think it’s pragmatic.” Yaowares Wasuwat, a noodle seller in Thailand’s Bangsaen Chonburi Province, said that she hoped to get the AstraZeneca vaccine for her second shot after being inoculated with Sinovac, but that she would take whatever was available. “I have nothing to lose,” she said. “The economy is so bad, we are gasping for air. It’s like dying while living, so just take whatever protection we can.” China’s early moves in the region stand in marked contrast with the United States, which was **slow to provide assistance**. The calculus **has now changed** under President Biden. Both Lloyd J. Austin III, the American secretary of defense, and Antony J. Blinken, the secretary of state, had meetings with top officials in Southeast Asia in recent weeks. They **noted** the **donations of roughly 20 million shots**. After Mr. Austin visited the Philippines, Manila restored a defense agreement that had been stuck in limbo for more than a year after Mr. Duterte threatened to terminate it. The agreement, which would continue to allow American troops and equipment to be moved in and out of the Philippines, could thwart China’s goal to push the American military out of the region.

#### Pre-empting the 1AR push on Latin America Key to LIO – this card doesn’t say it so don’t give it to them – Southeast Asia is more important to check back China’s rise since it’s in China’s own backyard.

#### Biden is shipping Vaccines to Latin America – post-dates yours by a Month.

Gramer 7-9 Robbie Gramer 7-9-2021 "U.S. Blunts China's Vaccine Diplomacy in Latin America" <https://archive.is/IGWnF#selection-1029.0-1069.263> (diplomacy and national security reporter at Foreign Policy.)//Elmer

The **U**nited **S**tates is **ramping up** the delivery of **coronavirus vaccines to Latin America** in a move aimed at addressing the region’s public health crisis, but the **endeavor could** also **curb China’s efforts to wield its vaccine exports for geopolitical influence.** U.S. President Joe Biden declared the United States would **export** up to **80 million vaccines** to other countries, and in recent weeks, his administration announced a slew of deliveries to countries in Central and South America—including initial shipments of 2.5 million vaccine doses to Colombia, 2 million doses to Peru, 3 million doses to Brazil, 1 million doses to Paraguay, 1.5 million doses to Honduras, and 1.35 million doses to Mexico. The flurry of announcements **signal** the **U**nited **S**tates is **turning a corner in vaccine diplomacy in Latin America** after lagging behind both Russia and China for months in early vaccine exports to the region. “All in, when you look at what the United States has been sharing, Latin America has been by far the largest beneficiary. And this is just the beginning,” said Juan Gonzalez, senior director for the Western Hemisphere on the White House National Security Council.