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#### Capitalism fail inev, and aff reform gives power to the broken system, pinning the consequences on IP, regulations fail

Svart 19 [Maria Svart, “Capitalism isn't 'broken'. It's working all too well - and we're the worse for it”, Guardian, Wed 12 Jun 2019 02.00 EDT, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/jun/12/capitalism-isnt-broken-its-working-all-too-well-and-were-the-worse-for-it>] //NR

Capitalism is not broken. It is working all too well, concentrating money in the hands of the few by exploiting the work of the many. Runaway climate change, war, mass migration, widespread poverty and ever-increasing authoritarianism are the inevitable results of an economic system that rewards corporate actors for their absolute commitment to profit, regardless of the broader consequences. Richard Reeves, guest editor of this series, suggests we can simply “fight to crowbar the doors open for women and people of color,” allowing them to benefit from market capitalism alongside white men. But that misses the point. A job with “a decent wage … some satisfaction and security” is quickly becoming a thing of the past, including for those of us in the wealthiest countries. It’s not just that “corporations hoard power and extract value from workers, without letting those workers share in the massive wealth they help create”, as Cory Booker argues; it’s that these dynamics at the individual level, felt by each of us, are also at play globally, felt by whole countries and regions. Exploitation is not a bug in capitalism, it is a feature. That giant sucking sound we can all hear is capital benefiting from decades of political, economic and ideological war against the rest of us. We must invest in public health and education infrastructure at home and abroad to increase community resiliency in a climate-fractured world, and build a global economy based on democratic control of production. When the system incentivizes making quarterly profits, rather than long-term balance and safety for all, it jeopardizes our very survival. We also need to democratize energy production and disband the dirty fossil fuel industry that is driving us off the climate cliff. Some billionaires are finally expressing concern about the status quo. But even they can’t escape a system where the ease of externalizing costs and exploiting labor makes it impossible to be both competitive and sustainable. Exploitation is not a bug in capitalism, it is a feature There has only been one period in which the fruits of labor were shared relatively equally: the post-second world war capital-labor compromise. Strong worker movements fought for robust welfare states under unique economic and political circumstances. But this arrangement could not hold. In response to François Mitterrand’s move to massively expand labor rights and nationalize a quarter of French industry, business interests launched a capital strike which spurred recession and became a portent of things to come. The threat of real working-class power was too great, and the system self-corrected. Today, we have as few as 12 years to transform our economic system and reverse the climate crisis. Yet just last month Donald Trump signed two executive orders to make it easier for fossil fuel corporations to build oil and gas pipelines and limit our ability to block them. This has been a bipartisan betrayal, however: in 2015 President Obama granted Shell Oil a permit to drill in the Arctic four days after declaring that the US would be a leader against the climate crisis. Desperate times call for radical measures. This starts with upending a system that was built to redistribute wealth and power from the many to the few. Working people and our families will not only survive, but thrive, from the jobs created by massive public investment in restructuring our energy grid and transforming our world. And we know the only ones willing to make that demand are those of us who are currently being squeezed by private interests for every last drop of profit. Young people know this, especially, but it will take all of us. Rather than trying to fix capitalism, we should be seeking to replace it.

#### Aff is an example of slash and burn capitalism which discloses socialist goals, and promotes unregulated capitalism

Williams 20 [Joan C. Williams and Ro Khanna, Harvard Buisness Review, “It’s Time to End Slash-and-Burn Capitalism”, October 28, 2020. <https://hbr.org/2020/10/its-time-to-end-slash-and-burn-capitalism>] NR

The conversation about stakeholder capitalism is heartening evidence that the business community recognizes that capitalism has gone seriously off track. The obvious criticism is that, while CEOs are well-placed to pursue profits, they are ill-suited to weigh and balance the needs of the environment and many different stakeholders, as has been cogently argued in The New York Times. And so far, the follow-through on the embrace of stakeholder capitalism has been decidedly mixed. What’s needed is not to make CEOs into central planners but to evolve toward sustainable capitalism — and away from the slash-and-burn capitalism of recent decades. In their pursuit of quarterly profits and high salaries, there has emerged since the 1980s a dysfunctional version of capitalism that does to the economy what clearcutting does to forests — destroys the conditions necessary for long-term success by focusing excessively on short-term profits. We don’t need to reinvent capitalism. We just need to practice it. That means that corporations that embrace market mechanisms and decry government intervention in the good times should not change the rules when times turn tough. Privatizing profits while socializing risks isn’t capitalism: It’s rigged roulette. Equally important, practicing capitalism does not mean insisting on special treatment from government that benefits shareholders at the expense of other stakeholders. And it means treating government as the vital partner to business, one that supports the physical and social infrastructure, and the political stability, that make business possible. The pattern of privatizing profits while socializing risk goes back to the 2008 recession, and has continued in the current crisis: in the U.S., the Pandemic Unemployment Assistance covers independent contractors, but American companies pay into the tax that finances unemployment insurance only for workers classified as employees. So, in effect, companies that rely on gig workers have shifted the cost of those workers’ unemployment insurance onto taxpayers. So have traditional companies that pay so little that their workers qualify for Medicaid and other programs, shifting their health insurance costs onto the U.S. taxpayer; in fact, there’s a company that provides a service used throughout the U.S. to help corporate employees shift over from company benefits to government programs. But the airlines are the best example. During the flush times, airlines happily pocketed the profits on the grounds that they are private. But when travel tanked during the pandemic, suddenly airlines insisted on huge bailouts on the grounds that saving them entails a public good. As we saw in 2008, this creates moral hazards that undermine the incentive structures that make capitalism work. Starving Government Sustainable capitalism requires paying a fair share in taxes, but slash-and-burn capitalism aims to do exactly the opposite. In the process, it has severely hobbled government’s ability to deliver basic services. As the pandemic has shown so dramatically, the instinctive assumption that businesses thrive better when taxes are as low as possible is factually incorrect. “Starving the beast” led to the gutting of public health departments, which during the pandemic has had devastating effects for the economy and the businesses that operate within it. Even if the administration had wanted to take the kinds of effective steps that have worked so well in countries that have reopened, we did not have the public health infrastructure to do so. Digging deeper, slash-and-burn capitalism has undermined trust in government. That trust has been plummeting for decades, often fueled by business-financed campaigns against “over-regulation” and government programs. Only 17% of Americans say they trust government most or all of the time, among the lowest levels in the past half-century. The social contract to adhere to basic public health measures has collapsed, former CDC Director Dr. Richard Besser has pointed out. As elected officials and public health leaders respond to the pandemic, they have to contend with public indifference at best and death threats at worst: Dr. Anthony Fauci now has round-the-clock protection. The cumulative effects of distrust in, and defunding of, government have led us unable to launch an effective response to the pandemic. The U.S. has the highest death count in the world, the worst death rate among major countries, and an economy unable to reopen effectively. This is not an isolated example. The anti-tax movement has led to an evisceration of property taxes in California and elsewhere. One result is that California public schools went from the first to the worst — and now schools in California and elsewhere don’t have the funds to make distance learning effective or to reopen in a way that’s safe. Schools are part of the basic infrastructure needed to get Americans to work. Massive public disinvestment also affects literal infrastructure: Our collapsing bridges make it literally impossible for workers to show up. Distrust of government also means we lack the care infrastructure that enables workers to show up for work, most notably paid family leave and childcare. As a result, some companies offered frontline workers $100 per shift to cover child care at the start of the pandemic, and paid leave is now financed through private employers rather than, as in virtually every other industrialized country, through the government. Is this really better for business? Profit and Pay Globalized supply chains are yet another example of slash-and-burn capitalism that looks different today than it did six months ago. Prominent members of both parties now recognize that globalized supply chains have created an economy that is hyper profitable but not resilient, to quote U.S. Senator Marco Rubio’s insightful analysis. The U.S.’s reliance on China for medical supplies from PPE to pharmaceuticals highlights again the vulnerability of an economy hyper focused on short-term profits without a thought to sustaining economic stability not just through thick, but also through thin. But the single most important example of slash-and-burn capitalism concerns wages. The current business philosophy that wages are just another cost to be cut is relatively recent. In 1914, Henry Ford — Henry Ford! — doubled wages because he recognized that workers need enough money to create demand, and he wanted his workers to be able to afford his cars. Half a century later, Kodak’s annual report listed the generous wages and benefits it paid its staff as proud accomplishments in its report to shareholders. That’s such a contrast to large, rich companies today that classify a third or more of their workforces as contractors even though they often work full time, sometimes for years. The unspoken core belief of contemporary capitalism reflects an old adage: to make the rich work harder, pay them more; to make the poor work harder, pay them less. That’s the logic behind the fact that executive salaries have ballooned from 20 times to over 300 times the average employee’s wage in recent decades, while wages for the formerly middle class have barely budged. Shareholder capitalism is really managerial-capture capitalism, as is evidenced by the company after company where CEOs’ compensation has skyrocketed during the pandemic. No wonder the 1% keeps getting richer: it’s not hard to win at rigged roulette. Slash-and-burn capitalism’s obsession with controlling labor costs has led to a sharp diminution in the sharing of productivity gains with the workforce that created them. During the decades after World War II, wages used to rise when productivity did; if that trend had continued, wages would be twice what they are today. As a result, only half of Americans born in 1980 will do better than their parents; virtually all Americans used to. The resulting pain and fury at the loss of the American dream has fueled economic populism. Many Trump voters are from the fragile or formerly middle class, deeply rooted in communities that are being left behind: voters in counties suffering economic distress trended for Trump. “We’re voting with our middle finger,” said one. The result is a dysfunctional economic populism that’s bad for business. It’s not just the trade wars, whose cost has been born chiefly by American consumers and businesses. The economic fury driving far-right populism is leading to the kind of political instability American business has rarely had to worry about. We have a president openly talking about not leaving office if he loses, and white supremacists just thwarted in a plan to kidnap the governor of Michigan. It’s time to replace slash-and-burn capitalism with sustainable capitalism that provides the economic and political infrastructure needed to support a healthy economy. Policy proposals are important, but first things first: let’s stop letting ideology distort our discussions of government and the market. The right is starry eyed about the market but coldly realistic about the limitations of government. The left is starry eyed about government but coldly realistic about the limitations of the market. As Churchill once said about democracy, it’s the worst possible system except for all the others. Both the market and the government are deeply flawed tools. But they are all we have. Let’s start a conversation about how to use them to restore the American dream of a stable government, a thriving economy, and a healthy middle class.

#### The impact is racial capitalism: the global system that is recognized by war, colonialism, slavery, genocide, fascism, and dispossession – it deploys liberalist ideals of individualism that corrupts movements and undermines any and all social change.

Jodi Melamed, 2015, is associate professor of English and Africana Studies at Marquette University. She is the author of Represent and Destroy: Rationalizing Violence in the New Racial Capitalism (University of Minnesota Press, 2011) and has published many articles and chapters in a wide array of journals and editions “Racial Capitalism” published in Critical Ethnic Studies , Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 2015), pp. 76-85. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/jcritethnstud.1.1.0076

This contribution to the inaugural volume of the Critical Ethnic Studies seeks to strengthen the activist hermeneutic “**racial capitalism” to respond to three conditions** with which critical ethnic studies must reckon in the present. The first is that so-called **primitive accumulation—where capital is accrued through transparently violent means (war, land-grabbing, dispossession, neo/colonialism)—has become everywhere interlinked and continuous** with accumulation through expanded reproduction, which we used to think of as requiring only “the silent compulsion of economic relations.”1 **With the top 10 percent taking 50 percent of total U.S. income** in 2012, and the top 1 percent taking a striking 95 percent of all post-Recession income gains, it has become increasingly plain that **accumulation for financial asset owning classes requires violence toward others and seeks to expropriate for capital the entire field of social provision (land, work, education, health).**2 The second condition is the **degree to which ideologies of individualism, liberalism, and democracy, shaped by and shaping market economies and capitalist rationality from their mutual inception, monopolize the terms of sociality,** despite their increasing hollowness in the face of neoliberalism’s predations. The third condition is the emergence of new horizons of activism that challenge the interpretative limits of ethnic studies in that they exceed the antimonies of political/economic activism, bust up old terms and geographies of solidarity, and are often Indigenous-led, requiring a rethinking of activist scholarship in light of the importance of Indigenous activism and critical theory. Our dominant critical understanding of the term racial capitalism stays close to the usage of its originator, Cedric Robinson, in his seminal Black Marxism: The Making of a Black Radical Tradition. 3 Robinson develops the term to correct the developmentalism and racism that led Marx and Engels to believe mistakenly that European bourgeois society would rationalize social relations. Instead, Robinson explains, the obverse occurred: “**The development, organization, and expansion of capitalist society pursued essentially racial directions, so too did social ideology. As a material force . . . racialism would inevitably permeate the social structures emergent from capitalism**. I have used the term ‘racial capitalism’ to refer . . . to the subsequent structure as a historical agency.”4 Thus the term “racial capitalism” requires its users to recognize that capitalism is racial capitalism. **Capital can only be capital when it is accumulating, and it can only accumulate by producing and moving through relations of severe inequality among human groups**—c

#### The alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only the vertical dual power organizing can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct unproductive tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for international liberation.

**Escalante 18**  
(Alyson Escalante, you should totally read her work for non-debate reasons, Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/> rvs)

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: **in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party.** It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for **holding party members accountable**,

## 2

#### **Text—The member nations of the World Trade Organization except the United States of America ought to reduce intellectual property protections for COVID-19 medicines.**

#### It competes and solves the whole case—normal means is unanimous support but the counterplan has the US oppose the waiver and have other WTO members force a vote t0 pass with a supermajority

Moore and Moodie 8/5 [Rory Moore (EvoNexus CEO & Co-Founder / Founder, Peregrine Semiconductor Corp. & Silicon Wave, Inc.), and Bronwen Moodie (A candidate patent attorney with a background in Genetics and Biotechnology.), 05 August 2021, “Update on the proposed TRIPS waiver for COVID-19”, IP STARS, <https://www.ipstars.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Update-on-the-proposed-TRIPS-waiver-for-COVID-19/Index/7386>] Garg

Obligations under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) may be waived under “exceptional circumstances” 1. Waiver decisions are taken by the highest decision-making body of the World Trade Organization (WTO). This is the Ministerial Conference, which is attended by trade ministers and other senior officials from the organization’s 164 members. It is customary for a full consensus of all WTO members to be required for decisions on waivers; however, if there is no agreement a vote can be forced, and a three-fourths majority will suffice to pass a waiver.

## 3

#### Drug price controls coming now but Biden PC key

Weisman 8/12 Weisman, Jonathan. Jonathan Weisman is a congressional correspondent, veteran Washington journalist. "Biden Presses Congress to Act on Prescription Drug Prices." N.Y. Times, 12 Aug. 2021, www.nytimes.com/2021/08/12/us/politics/biden-prescription-drugs.html.

WASHINGTON — President Biden implored Congress on Thursday to include strict controls on prescription drug prices in the mammoth social policy bill that Democrats plan to draft this fall, hitting on an issue that his predecessor campaigned on but failed to achieve.

Mr. Biden said he wanted at least three measures included in the $3.5 trillion social policy bill that Democrats hope to pass using budget rules that would protect it from a Republican filibuster. He wants Medicare to be granted the power to negotiate lower drug prices, pharmaceutical companies to face penalties if they raise prices faster than inflation, and a new cap on how much Medicare recipients have to spend on medications.

“There aren’t a lot of things that almost every American could agree on,” the president said at the White House. “But I think it is safe to say that all of us, whatever our background or our age and where we live, could agree that prescription drug prices are outrageously expensive in America.”

The president was pushing on an open door. Congressional Democrats have already said they want to include all three measures in the so-called reconciliation bill that House and Senate committees hope to assemble.

“The Finance Committee will be a central part of the debate when it comes to lowering Americans’ health care costs and making high-quality health care available to more families,” the panel’s chairman, Senator Ron Wyden of Oregon, said as Senate Democrats unveiled the $3.5 trillion budget blueprint that would allow them to pass the legislation without a Republican vote.

#### Passing a WTO patent waiver stops split-lobbying efforts from Big Pharma – they’ll focus on fighting drug pricing reform instead

Stacey and Asgari 5/26 Kiran Stacey, Washington correspondent for the FT; Nikou Asgari, reporter covering the US pharmaceutical industry. "How drugmakers went from vaccine heroes to patent villains within weeks." 26 May. 2021, www.ft.com/content/96d10dc8-8158-4cbc-9876-0b7d0a1e774e.

The tone of that call, followed by the decision to support a patent waver proposal at the World Trade Organization, has triggered concerns among some in the pharmaceutical industry, who fear they will lose political capital amassed during the pandemic at a crucial moment in their fight against drug pricing controls in the US. “One day Bourla is being feted by the president for making vaccines which will help end the pandemic, the next he is being lectured by one of Biden’s senior officials for not supplying vaccines to India — even though the Pfizer vaccine hasn’t been approved there,” said one person briefed on the call. “It did shake the industry a bit.” American drugmakers have been the target of political criticism for years, accused of fuelling the US opioid epidemic and making their treatments unaffordable for millions of Americans. The fact that the Biden administration was willing to support the [patent] waiver shows . . . the pharma industry is not going to be as strong as it was in the past Michael Carrier, Rutgers university Many in the industry hoped their response to the pandemic would help to persuade politicians and the wider public that the US benefits from having a well-funded pharmaceutical industry with strong intellectual property protections. The country has carried out one of the fastest Covid-19 vaccine rollouts in the world, largely thanks to steady supplies from Pfizer and its smaller rival Moderna. “The Covid-19 vaccine is a proof point for the powerful combination of breakthrough science and the private sector,” said Sally Susman, chief corporate affairs officer at Pfizer. The public agrees. Surveys conducted by The Harris Poll found that approval of the pharmaceutical industry had almost doubled from 32 per cent in January last year to 62 per cent in February this year. But the decision to support the move at the WTO to waive international intellectual property rights on Covid vaccines suggests the Biden administration is not entirely convinced by the arguments put forward by drugmakers’ well-funded army of lobbyists. “The fact that the Biden administration was willing to support the waiver shows the argument has shifted and that the pharma industry is not going to be as strong as it was in the past,” said Michael Carrier, a law professor at Rutgers university in Camden, New Jersey. The industry spends far more on lobbying than any other — more than $92m this year, according to figures compiled by the Washington-based Center for Responsive Politics. That is more than double the outlay from the electronics industry, which is the next heaviest spender. It also donates liberally, and increasingly to Democrats. CRP figures show that 2020 was the first year in which the industry gave significantly more to Democratic candidates than Republican ones. Pfizer donated $1m to Biden’s inaugural fund, though the money did not buy the kind of high-level access it would have done in previous years due to the virtual nature of many of the inaugural events. The industry is primarily occupied by two issues in Washington: the WTO’s proposed intellectual property waiver and legislation to curb drug prices. On the former, companies are keen to limit the scope of any waiver. On the latter, they want to stop a bill that would allow the government to negotiate the prices for certain drugs prescribed to seniors covered by the publicly-funded Medicare scheme. The industry’s most prominent voice on such issues is Steve Ubl, chief executive of industry group Phrma and a veteran Washington operator. “The Biden administration made a politically expedient decision [on the WTO waiver], but we think we are still able to lean in on other debates such as drug pricing,” he said. Some are concerned that Ubl, a former aide to the Republican senator Chuck Grassley, is too obviously corporate and Republican to make inroads in the Democratically-controlled administration and Congress. Instead, some say Michelle McMurry-Heath, the chief executive of the smaller Biotechnology Innovation Organization, might have more success. “Steve has been very successful for years, but Michelle is a bit more dynamic and less buttoned-up,” said one industry lobbyist. Before rushing to do the WTO waiver, perhaps we should get our own house in order first Debra Dixon, Ferox Strategies Those in the industry who have deep connections within the Democratic party are in strong demand, such as Susman, who worked as a senior official in the commerce department during the Clinton administration. Another is Debra Dixon, a former chief of staff to the health secretary Xavier Becerra. Dixon works for Ferox Strategies and was recently hired by Eli Lilly, which has been criticised for raising the prices of its insulin drugs. Dixon said the industry should focus on how therapeutics can “alleviate health disparities” when discussing drug prices. She added: “While the US vaccine rollout has gone well, there are still people falling through the cracks. Before rushing to do the WTO waiver, perhaps we should get our own house in order first.” Moderna, meanwhile, has hired Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck as one of its external lobbying firms. Its team includes Nadeam Elshami, the former chief of staff to Nancy Pelosi, the Democratic Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Carmencita Whonder, a former aide to Chuck Schumer, the Democratic Senate majority leader. There are some signs that their efforts are paying off. Earlier this month 10 Democrats in the House sent a letter to Pelosi urging her to pursue drug pricing reforms on a bipartisan basis. That missive was interpreted as a criticism of the proposal for the government to negotiate drug prices, which has little support among Republicans. Recommended Pharmaceuticals sector Biden urged to oblige US vaccine makers to share technology Scott Peters, the lead signatory on that letter, was the sixth-highest recipient in the House of money from the pharma industry in the last election cycle, according to the CRP. Others in Congress also continue to champion the industry, especially those in New Jersey and Delaware, where many pharma companies have a significant presence. Industry lobbyists say they expect Chris Coons, the senator from Delaware and a longtime friend of Biden, to prove a vital ally. Many lobbyists hope that Biden will prove receptive to the industry’s arguments, in part because he worked closely with pharmaceutical companies as vice-president while developing his “cancer moonshot” to help find a cure for the disease. But they do not necessarily need to win the president round. With both houses of Congress finely balanced, a handful of Democratic supporters could squash the reforms being proposed by those on the left of the party. “We don’t need many people to block HR3,” said one industry lobbyist, referring to the proposed bill that would allow the government to negotiate some drug prices. “The 10 people that signed that letter could be enough to get us what we want.”

#### And a WTO waiver takes time, energy, and political capital away from domestic legislation – big pharma and EU allies

Bhadrakumar 5/9 M K Bhadrakumar is a former Indian diplomat. "Biden’s talk of vaccine IP waiver is political theater." Asia Times, May 9, 2021, asiatimes.com/2021/05/bidens-talk-of-vaccine-ip-waiver-is-political-theater.

On the other hand, Biden, whose political life of half a century was largely spent in the US Congress, is well aware of the awesome clout of the pharmaceutical companies in American politics. From that lobby’s perspective, the patent waiver “amounts to the expropriation of the property of the pharmaceutical companies whose innovation and financial investments made the development of Covid-19 vaccines possible in the first place,” as a senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security puts it. The US pharmaceutical industry and congressional Republicans have already gone on the offensive blasting Biden’s announcement, saying it undermines incentives for American innovation. Besides, the argument goes, even with the patent waiver, vaccine manufacturing is a complex process and is not like simply flipping a switch. Senator Richard Burr, the top Republican on the US Senate Health Committee, denounced Biden’s decision. “Intellectual property protections are part of the reason we have these life-saving products,” he said. “Stripping these protections only ensures we won’t have the vaccines or treatments we need when the next pandemic occurs.” The Republican senators backed by Republican Study Committee chairman Jim Banks propose to introduce legislation to block the move. Clearly, Biden would rather spend his political capital on getting the necessary legislation through Congress to advance his domestic reform agenda rather than spend time and energy to take on the pharmaceutical industry to burnish his image as a good Samaritan on the world stage. Conceivably, Biden could be counting on the “text-based negotiations” at the WTO dragging on for months, if not years, without reaching anywhere. The US support for the waiver could even be a tactic to persuade pharmaceutical firms to back less drastic steps like sharing technology and expanding joint ventures to boost global production quickly. So far Covid-19 vaccines have been distributed primarily to the wealthy countries that developed them, while the pandemic sweeps through poorer ones such as India, and the real goal is, after all, expanded vaccine distribution. Biden is well aware that there will be huge opposition to the TRIPS waiver from the United States’ European allies as well. The British press has reported that the UK has been in closed-door talks at the World Trade Organization in recent months along with the likes of Australia, Canada, Japan, Norway, Singapore, the European Union and the US, who all opposed the idea.

#### The threat of a waiver to manipulate Pharma is good but an actual waiver wastes political capital on other health issues

Silverman 6/2 Rachel Silverman is a policy fellow at the Center for Global Development. Master’s of philosophy with distinction in public health from the University of Cambridge, which she attended as a Gates Cambridge Scholar. She also holds a BA with distinction in international relations and economics from Stanford University.Argument’, 'The. "Opinion | Could Spilling Big Pharma’s Secrets Vaccinate the World?" N.Y. Times, 2 June 2021, [www.nytimes.com/2021/06/02/opinion/covid-vaccine-ip-waiver.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2021/06/02/opinion/covid-vaccine-ip-waiver.html). [the original podcast was between multiple people, only person carded is Silverman so they’re the only person cited]

[rachel silverman] So I very much agree with Tahir that a lot of this is theater. And I guess that gets to part of my concern about the waiver, which is, I’m not, again, that opposed to the waiver per se. I’m a little bit wishy-washy on it. I think there are people who yell doom about it. I don’t think it will spell doom. But what I really am concerned about is that while I do think the waiver campaign has been helpful in terms of putting pressure on the pharmaceutical industry, you know, that threat of a stick that we’re talking about, what I do worry about is that it’s sucking up a lot of political oxygen. And it’s the kind of thing where the U.S. can come out with a statement and say, oh, yes, we support the waiver. And what that will really mean is we spend the next 12 months negotiating it down in the W.T.O., and we coordinate with the Europeans to weaken it further. And everyone applauds, and everyone says, oh, great, what a great move towards vaccine equity. And nothing really comes of it. And it takes pressure off them to address the more immediate challenges. And I’d say we had a letter out from my institution, the Center for Global Development, and some other think tanks, calling on the Biden administration to do a lot more, generally, more money, more support, more engagement, better dose sharing, more leadership in this space. And we haven’t seen it. The reality of the world we live in is there’s a limited amount of political capital. And I’m worried we’re sucking it up on this, which will maybe, maybe best case scenario, have an impact six to nine months down the road if everything goes right, and not the immediate measures that we could be taking worldwide.

#### Drug price controls massively reduce healthcare costs across the board – even assuming conservative models

Gamba 6/9 Gamba, Tyler. Author at the AJMC. "Adoption of the Lower Drug Costs Now Act May Lead to Billions in Savings." AJMC, 9 June 2021, www.ajmc.com/view/adoption-of-the-lower-drug-costs-now-act-may-lead-to-billions-in-savings.

H.R.3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act would improve efficiency and produce billions in savings for the commercial health care market’s employers and end consumers if fully implemented, according to a new study from Milliman commissioned by the West Health Policy Center. Among its goals, the act’s provisions seek to reduce prescription drug costs, increase drug price transparency, lower member out-of-pocket spending, and increase potential coverage eligibility. Costs for the most expensive brand drugs in the United States would be negotiated between the manufacturers and the HHS secretary. Significant drug cost increases over the rate of inflation would need to be issued back as rebates to CMS. To predict the effects of such reforms, the Milliman study sought quantitative estimates for the scope of these changes. Milliman’s models incorporated several variables, including current trends and projected spending based on different percentage adjustments to drug prices, rebates, and public vs private cost rates from 2023 through 2029. The study estimates 46% of drug spending would be subject to negotiation under the legislation’s Title I by 2026, with an average 2.5% reduction in total commercial market claims by 2029.Overall, successful implementation of H.R. 3 means employers may reduce their health care expenditures by $195 billion while employees would save $61 billion. Of this latter amount, reduced premiums would account for $53 billion and out-of-pocket costs, $8 billion. Overall, the market covered by the Affordable Care Act (ACA) could see savings of $58 billion, comprising $34 billon in reduced beneficiary premiums, $21 billion in federal savings by reduced Advance-Premium Tax Credits, and $2 billion in lower cost-sharing. The estimates assume manufacturers could make such increases to the prices at a faster rate than the current yearly trends. This possibility still leads to stronger total savings via H.R. 3’s Title I. The study does not factor in further limitations on increases by plan sponsors and pharmacy benefit managers, which could improve savings for employers and employees, because it mainly applies to Medicare. Under the most conservative pricing model—where manufacturers hypothetically increase supply costs to unprecedented highs to minimize revenue loses—$250 billion in lower costs are still passed on to employers and employees. Additionally, the study notes that although end consumers are generally responsible for most of their plan premiums, and thus would get most of the savings, the federal government also would save on the significant portion it pays toward member premiums in the individual marketplaces.

#### Collapses the economy

Howrigon, 16 — Ron Howrigon, M.S. in Economics with a focus on Health Economics from North Carolina State University, President and Founder of Fulcrum Strategies, 18 Years of Experience in Healthcare, 12-30-2016, “Flatlining: How Healthcare Could Kill the U.S. Economy,” Greenbranch Publishing, 1st Edition, Accessed via Minnesota Libraries, Date Accessed: 8-10

Ok, let’s shift from looking at individuals to looking at the big picture—from micro- to macroeconomics. It’s important to understand where healthcare **fits into the big picture** when it comes to the economy at large. Most people who don’t work in the industry don’t clearly understand how much of the U.S. economy healthcare makes up. In fact, given the size of the economy, healthcare in the U.S. can be impactful on the ***world* economy**. This is important to understand because future changes in healthcare not only affect ow we get care and how much we pay for it, but could also significantly affect things like **unemployment**, the **national debt**, and **interest rates**. The influences on the U.S. economy will have **a ripple effect** on other countries around the world. In 1960, healthcare as a market accounted for only 5% of the U.S. economy. For every dollar transacted, only 5 cents were spent for healthcare. The entire U.S. economy was $543 billion, and healthcare accounted for about $27 billion. By itself, in 1960, the U.S. healthcare market would rank as the 15th largest world economy, putting it just in front of the GDP (Gross Domestic Product) of Australia and just behind the GDP of Italy. Think about that for a minute: the U.S., **spent more money on healthcare** than the Australians did on everything! To put this further into perspective, in 1960, the U.S. Department of Defense was twice as large as healthcare. The Defense Department consumed 10% of the U.S. economy, which means it would rank as the 11th largest world economy just in front of Japan and just behind China. Now fast-forward 50 years. In 2010, the United States GDP was $15 trillion. The total healthcare expenditures in the United States for 2010 were $2.6 trillion. At $2.6 trillion, the U.S. healthcare market has moved up from 15th and now ranks as the **5th largest world economy**, just behind Germany and just ahead of both France and the United Kingdom. That means that while healthcare was only 5% of GDP in 1960, it has risen to over 17% of GDP in only 50 years. Over that same time, the Defense Department has gone from 10% of GDP to less than 5% of GDP. This means that in terms in terms of its portion of the U.S. economy, defense spending has been reduced by half while healthcare spending has more than tripled. If **healthcare** continues to trend at the same pace it has for the last 50 years, it will consume more than **50% of the U.S. economy** by the year 2060. Every economist worth their salt will tell you that health-care will never reach 50% of the economy. It’s simply not possible because of **all the other things** it would have to **crowd out to reach** that point. So, if we know healthcare can’t grow to 50% of our economy, **where is the breaking point?** **At what point does healthcare consume so much of the economy that it breaks the bank**, so to speak? This is the big question when it comes to healthcare. If something doesn’t happen to reverse the 50-year trend we’ve been riding, when will the healthcare bubble burst? How bad will it be and how exactly will it happen? While no one knows the **exact answers** to those questions, economists and healthcare experts agree that something needs to **happen**, because we simply **can’t continue on this trend** forever. Another way to look at healthcare is to study its impact on the federal budget and the national debt. In 1998, federal healthcare spending accounted for 19% of the revenue taken in by the government. Just eight years later, in 2006, healthcare spending had increased to 24% of federal revenue. In 2010, the Affordable Healthcare Act passed and significantly increased federal spending accounted for almost one-third of all revenue received by the government and surpassed Social Security as the largest single budget category. What makes this trend even more alarming is the fact that revenue to the federal government double from 1998 to 2016. That means healthcare spending by the federal government has almost quadrupled in terms of actual dollars in that same time period. If this trend continues for the next 20 years, healthcare spending will account for over half the revenue received by the government by the year 2035. Again, the simply can’t happen without causing significant issue for the financial wellbeing of out country. In recent history, the U.S. economy has experienced the near catastrophic failure of two major market segments. The first was the auto industry and the second was the housing industry. While each of these reached their breaking point for different reasons, they both required a significant government bailout to keep them from completely melting down. What is also true about both of **those market failures** is that, looking back, it’s easy to see the warning signs. What happens if health care is the next industry to suffer a major failure and collapse? It’s safe to say that a **health care meltdown** would make both the **auto**motive and **housing** industries’ experiences **seem minor** in comparison. While that may be hard to believe, it becomes clear if you look at the numbers. The **auto industry** contributes around 3.5 percent of this country’s GDP and employs 1.7 million people. This industry was deemed **“too big to fail”** which is the rationale the U.S. government used to finance its bail out. From 2009 through 2014, the federal government invested around $80 billion in the U.S. auto industry to keep it from collapsing. Health care is five times larger than the auto industry in terms of its percentage of GDP, and is ten times larger than the auto industry in terms of the number of people it employs. The construction industry (which includes all construction, not just housing) contributes about 6 percent of our country’s GDP and employs 6.1 million people. Again, the health care market dwarfs this industry. It’s **three times larger** in terms of GDP production and, with 18 million people employed in the health care sector, it’s three times larger than construction in this area, too. These comparisons give you an idea of just how significant a portion health care comprises of the U.S. economy. It also begins to help us understand the impact it would have on the economy if health care melted down like the auto and housing industries did. So, let’s continue the comparison and use our experience with the auto and housing industries to suggest to what order of magnitude the impact a failure in the health care market would cause our economy. The bailout in the auto industry cost the federal government $80 billion over five years. Imagine a similar failure in health care that prompted the federal government to propose a similar bailout program. Let’s imagine the government felt the need to inject cash into hospital systems and doctors’ offices to keep them afloat like they did with General Motors. Since health care is five times the size of the auto industry, a similar bailout could easily cost in excess of $400 billion. That’s about the same amount of money the federal government spends on welfare programs. To pay for a bailout of the health care industry, we’d have to eliminate all welfare programs in this country. Can you imagine the impact it would have on the economy if there were suddenly none of the assistance programs so many have come to rely upon? When the housing market crashed, it caused the loss of about 3 million jobs from its peak employment level of 7.4 million in 1996. Again, if we transfer that experience to the health care market, we come up with a truly frightening scenario. If health care lost 40 percent of its jobs like housing did, it would mean 7.2 million jobs lost. That’s more than four times the number of people who are employed by the entire auto industry — an industry that was considered too big to be allowed to fail. The loss of **7.2 million jobs** would increase the unemployment rate by 5 percent. That means we could easily top the **all-time high unemployment rate** for our country. OK, now it’s time to take a deep breath. I’m not convinced that health care is fated to **unavoidable failure** and economic catastrophe. That’s a worst-case scenario. The problem is that at even a fraction the severity of the auto or housing industry crises we’ve already faced, a health care collapse would still be devastating. Health care **can’t be allowed** to continue its current inflationary trending. I believe we are on the verge of some major changes in health care, and that how they’re **implemented** will determine their impact on the overall **economic picture** in this country and around the world. Continued failure to recognize the truth about health care will only cause the resulting market corrections to be worse than they need to be. I don’t want to diminish the pain and anguish that many people caught up in the housing crash experienced. I think an argument can be made, though, that if the health care market crashes and millions of people end up with no health care, the resulting fallout could be could be much worse than even the housing crisis.

#### Economic decline causes nuclear war

Tønnesson, 15 — Stein Tønnesson, Leader of East Asia Peace program at Uppsala University, Research Professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo, “Deterrence, Interdependence and Sino–US Peace” International Area Studies Review, Review Essay, Volume 18, Issue 3, Pages 297-311, SAGE Journals, Minnesota Libraries, Date Accessed: 8-4

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may **both inhibit and drive conflict** are right. Interdependence raises the **cost of conflict** for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and **negative trade expectations** may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or **anticipate their own nation’s decline** then they may blame this on **external dependence**, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately **refuse to be deterred by** either **nuclear arms** or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen **abruptly**, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party.

Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is **not** that **a territorial dispute** leads to war under present circumstances but that **changes in the world economy** alter those circumstances in ways that render **inter-state peace** more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have **unforeseen consequences** in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to **protect the world from Armageddon**, and **unreliably so**. Deterrence could **lose its credibility**: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third-party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to **intervene**.

## 4

#### Biotech is the new frontier; America is ahead but China is dangerously close

Gupta 6/11 [Gaurav Gupta, Biotech Investor, Founder of Ascendant BioCapital, a life science investment firm based in New York. Previously, Gaurav worked at OrbiMed Advisors, and served as a resident in neurological surgery at Columbia University Medical Center. He has co-authored over a dozen articles in peer-reviewed journals, filed a patent on a device for use in spine surgery, and edited a book on the technical and ethical implications of using tissue engineered products in the operating room. Dr. Gupta obtained his M.D. from the Stanford University School of Medicine, where he was a Paul and Daisy Soros Fellow, and B.S. and M.S.E. in biomedical engineering from Johns Hopkins University, where he was a Charles R. Westgate Scholar.) “As Washington Ties Pharma’s Hands, China Is Leaping Ahead” Barron’s Magazine: Commentary, China., 6/11/2021] RM

There should be no doubt that we are living at the dawn of a golden age of biomedical innovation. The American scientific engine that produced Covid-19 vaccines in record time was fueled by a convergence of advances in genomics, biomarkers, data science, and manufacturing years in the making. The first Food and Drug Administration approvals of a host of new product formats—oligonucleotide, bispecific, oncolytic virus, CAR-T, and lentivirus/AAV—all took place within the last decade. These represent an unprecedented expansion of the armamentarium that physicians have at their disposal to treat and cure disease. In the last few years, [47% of all new medicines](https://www.efpia.eu/media/554521/efpia_pharmafigures_2020_web.pdf) were invented by U.S. biopharma companies, with [homegrown startups](https://www.cbo.gov/publication/57126) driving the majority of innovation. The bulk of the remainder were developed by foreign companies specifically for the U.S. market. An indirect benefit of these trends is that most novel therapeutics undergo clinical development and early commercial launch here in the U.S. The rest of the world understands that the American patient has earlier and broader access to groundbreaking therapies via these mechanisms. Indeed, the past decade is filled with examples of medical “firsts” for American patients: the first cure for Hepatitis C, the first gene therapy for blindness, the first immunotherapy for cancer. Future rewards will be greater still if we preserve our current system of incentivizing and protecting innovation. The remarkable innovation capacity of our biopharmaceutical industry ought to be a source of national pride. Yet while “Made in America” is the global standard for medicines in development today, misguided policy risks ceding our scientific prowess to other countries in the future. This is particularly true in the case of China, where biotechnology has become a strategic pillar for the health of its people and economy. From 2016 to 2020, the market capitalization of all Chinese biopharma companies increased exponentially from [$1 billion to over $200 billion](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-03-01/xi-mobilizes-china-for-tech-revolution-to-cut-dependence-on-west). China saw over [$28 billion](https://www.bioworld.com/articles/506978-china-sees-five-year-highs-in-life-sciences-investments-and-partnering) invested in its life sciences sector in 2020, double the previous year’s amount. Returns on China’s investment are already arriving. The FDA approved a drug developed in China for the first time ever in 2019. While China’s innovation capacity currently remains behind America’s, my experiences as a biopharma professional make it clear they are doing everything they can to catch up and catch up fast. In fact, when I speak to Chinese biotechnology executives, they boast that they can run clinical trials faster than their U.S. counterparts. The danger of misguided policies that disincentivize pharmaceutical innovation in the U.S. is effectively driving that same innovation to China. If we close off the market in the U.S. at the same time that China is opening its market to innovative new products, then we will see companies choose to first launch impactful novel medicines in China, based on clinical trials conducted in China. Because the FDA rarely accepts data generated entirely outside the U.S., this relocation of research capacity will negatively affect Americans’ access to cutting-edge therapies. The biotechnology field is advancing rapidly. Promising technologies such as targeted protein degradation and gene editing are perhaps not far from being developed into impactful medicines, and the U.S. risks these technologies being mastered by Chinese companies. It is widely held that allowing China to gain an asymmetric edge in critical technologies such as AI or quantum computing could destabilize the geopolitical balance of power. The same is true of biotechnology. Chinese scientists were the first to edit the genomes of human embryos, in [contravention](https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2019/12/chinese-scientist-who-produced-genetically-altered-babies-sentenced-3-years-jail) of international standards, and the U.S. national security community believes China is [pushing ahead](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/national-security/china-has-done-human-testing-create-biologically-enhanced-super-soldiers-n1249914) with experimental concepts for biological and cognitive enhancement of soldiers and civilians. American policy should be focused on protecting, rather than undermining, the global dominance of our biotechnology industry.

#### The plan recapitulates IP to China, destroying competitive advantages

WSJ 5/6 [Wall Street Journal Editorial Board, WSJ Opinion Philosophy: “We speak for free markets and free people, the principles, if you will, marked in the watershed year of 1776 by Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence and Adam Smith's “Wealth of Nations.” So over the past century and into the next, the Journal stands for free trade and sound money; against confiscatory taxation and the ukases of kings and other collectivists; and for individual autonomy against dictators, bullies and even the tempers of momentary majorities.” Edited by Paul A. Gigot and Daniel Henninger, “Biden’s Vaccine IP Debacle: His patent heist is a blow to the Covid fight and U.S. biotech.” The WSJ Opinion: Review and Outlook, May 6, 2021] RM

We’ve already criticized President Biden’s bewildering decision Wednesday to endorse a patent waiver for Covid vaccines and therapies. But upon more reflection this may be the single worst presidential economic decision since Nixon’s wage-and-price controls. In one fell swoop he has destroyed tens of billions of dollars in U.S. intellectual property, set a destructive precedent that will reduce pharmaceutical investment, and surrendered America’s advantage in biotech, a key growth industry of the future. Handed an American triumph of innovation and a great soft-power opportunity, Mr. Biden throws it all away. \*\*\* India and South Africa have been pushing to suspend patents at the World Trade Organization for months. They claim that waiving IP protections for Covid vaccines and therapies is necessary to expand global access, but their motivation is patently self-interested. Both are large producers of generic drugs, though they have less expertise and capacity to make complex biologics like mRNA vaccines. They want to force Western pharmaceutical companies to hand over IP free of charge so they can produce and export vaccines and therapies for profit. Their strategy has been to shame Western leaders into surrendering with the help of Democrats in the U.S. But suspending IP isn’t necessary to expand supply and will impede safe vaccine production. The global vaccine supply is already increasing rapidly thanks to licensing agreements the vaccine makers have made with manufacturers around the world. Pfizer and BioNTech this week said they aimed to deliver three billion doses this year, up from last summer’s 1.2 billion estimate. Moderna increased its supply forecast for this year to between 800 million and a billion from 600 million. AstraZeneca says it has built a supply network with 25 manufacturing organizations in 15 countries to produce three billion doses this year. AstraZeneca and Novavax have leaned heavily on manufacturers in India to produce billions of doses reserved for lower-income countries. But India has restricted vaccine exports to supply its own population. IP simply isn’t restraining vaccine production. Busting patents also won’t speed up production, since it would take months for these countries to set up new facilities. Competition will increase for scarce ingredients, and less efficient manufacturers with little expertise would make it harder for licensed partners to produce vaccines. There’s also the problem of safety. Johnson & Johnson has experienced quality problems at an Emergent plant making its vaccines, and that’s in Baltimore. Imagine the potential problems with unlicensed producers in, say, Malaysia or Brazil. If vaccines made there have complications, confidence in licensed vaccines could plummet too. And who would Pfizer and Moderna sue to get their reputations back? The economic self-damage is also hard to fathom. The U.S. currently has a competitive advantage in biotech and biologics manufacturing, which could be a growing export industry. Waiving IP protections for Covid vaccines and medicines will give away America’s crown pharmaceutical jewels and make the U.S. and world more reliant on India and China for pharmaceuticals. Moderna has been working on mRNA vaccines for a decade. Covid represents its first success. Ditto for Novavax, which has been at it for three decades. Small biotech companies in the U.S. have been studying how to create vaccines using nasal sprays, pills and patches. Thanks to Mr. Biden, all this could become the property of foreign governments. Licensing agreements allow developers to share their IP while maintaining quality control. Breaking patents and forcing tech transfers will enable China and low-income countries to manufacture U.S. biotech products on their own. China’s current crop of vaccines are far less effective than those in the West, but soon Beijing might be able to purvey Pfizer knock-offs. The U.S. has spent years deploring China’s theft of American IP, and now the Biden Administration may voluntarily let China could reap profits from decades of American innovation. \*\*\* Instead of handing over American IP to the world, Mr. Biden could negotiate bilateral vaccine agreements and export excess U.S. supply. If Mr. Biden wants to increase global supply safely, the U.S. could spend more to help the companies produce more for export. Then the jobs would go to Americans. We thought this was the point of the production deal Mr. Biden negotiated between J&J and Merck. Alas, this President seems to be paying more attention these days to Elizabeth Warren, Bernie Sanders, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Nancy Pelosi. They think vaccines and new drugs can be conjured by government as a public good with no incentive for risk-taking or profit. This really is destructive socialism. Mr. Biden ought to listen to Angela Merkel. Pfizer’s partner BioNTech is a German firm, and the German Chancellor said Thursday that she opposes the WTO heist: “The protection of intellectual property is a source of innovation and it must remain so in the future.” At least IP is safe in Germany. Mr. Biden has sent a signal around the world that nobody’s intellectual property is safe in America.

#### China biotech heg causes a laundry list of impacts

Moore 19 Scott Moore - Director of the Penn Global China Program at the University of Pennsylvania, Young Professional and Water Resources Management Specialist at the World Bank Group, and Environment, Science, Technology, and Health Officer for China at the U.S. Department of State, Giorgio Ruffolo Post-Doctoral Research Fellow with the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University, Truman, Fulbright, and Rhodes Scholar., Foreign Policy, "China's Genetic Experiments Are Pushing Ethical Limits", NOVEMBER 8, 2019, 2:53 PM, https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/11/08/cloning-crispr-he-jiankui-china-biotech-boom-could-transform-lives-destroy-them/ - BD

When James Clapper, the U.S. director of national intelligence at the time, appeared before Congress in early January 2016 for an annual briefing of threats to the United States, he didn’t lack for material. Just a few weeks earlier, North Korea had tested a nuclear device, and Russia had begun deploying cruise missiles that appeared to violate a crucial arms-control agreement. But to the surprise of many experts, Clapper devoted a good chunk of his time to describing a much more exotic threat: biomedical research. Specifically, Clapper warned, “Research in genome editing conducted by countries with different regulatory or ethical standards than those of Western countries probably increases the risk of the creation of potentially harmful biological agents or products.”Clapper’s statement didn’t explicitly mention China—but it didn’t need to. As his testimony went on to make clear, while in the 20th century the United States and Soviet Union held the keys to preventing planetary catastrophe, in the 21st the principal players are the United States and China. And while in a previous age keeping Pandora’s box closed meant preventing nuclear war, today it’s about preventing biotech dangers. In just the past few years, the development of inexpensive gene-editing techniques has democratized biomedical research, producing a biotech bonanza in places such as China and creating a whole new category of security threats in the process, from the use of genetic information to persecute dissidents and minority groups to the development of sophisticated bioweapons.When it comes to the United States, China, and technology, artificial intelligence tends to grab most of the attention. But policymakers need to come to grips with the even bigger threat of biotechnology—and soon. Fortunately, though, shared concerns about China’s role in biotechnology also provide a rare chance for meaningful and productive engagement in shaping the rules of a new world. China’s starring role in preventing the 21st century’s biotech perils stems from its skyrocketing investment in biomedical research. Historically, Western countries, and especially the United States, have been the epicenter of research in the life sciences. The United States alone accounted for some 45 percent of biotech and medical patents filed in the 14-year period ending in 2013. But now, thanks to heavy state-backed investment, China is catching up. Economic plans instituted in 2015 call for the biotechnology sector to account for more than 4 percent of China’s total GDP by 2020, and estimates suggest that as of 2018, central, provincial, and local governments had already invested over $100 billion in the life sciences. Chinese venture capital and private equity investment in the life sciences, meanwhile, totaled some $45 billion just from 2015 to 2017. China has also invested considerable effort in competing with countries like the United States for biotech talent. Of some 7,000 researchers recruited under the Thousand Talents Plan since 2008, more than 1,400 specialized in the life sciences. A leading American geneticist, Harris Lewin, has warned that the United States is “starting to fall behind … the Chinese, who have always been good collaborators, [are] now taking the lead.” For the United States and other Western countries, China’s growing role in biomedical research is raising plenty of concern. Several Chinese researchers have shown a willingness to ignore ethical and regulatory constraints on genetic research. In 2018, He Jiankui became a poster child for scientific irresponsibility when he announced he had edited the genes of two twins in utero without following basic safety protocols. He reportedly dismissed them as guidelines, not laws. Yet the reaction at home was not what He had hoped for. His research had been made possible by the relatively lax standards of Chinese universities, even as he had kept the true nature of it secret from many involved – while discussing it with a small group of Western bioethicists and scientists, who stressed their disapproval. It’s not uncommon in China to break the rules and be lauded for the results anyway, whatever the field. For He, though, the vast international attention that came after the story broke cost him his career and possibly his freedom. Chinese media rushed to stress official disapproval of the experiments. Even the overt purpose of the editing – to ensure that the babies, born to HIV+ mothers, enjoyed protection against the virus – turned out to be scientifically weak. As China’s biotech sector grows, so too do fears that Chinese researchers like He will be more willing to push the limits of both science and ethics than those in the United States. Earlier this year, Chinese researchers recorded another mind-bending milestone when they implanted human genes linked to intelligence into monkey embryos—and then said that the monkeys performed better on memory tests. The dominance of the party-state in China raises serious concerns around biotechnology, especially because it carries increasingly ethnonationalist tone. When in 2018 Chinese researchers created the world’s first primate clones, for example, they dubbed them Zhong Zhong and Hua Hua, from the term zhonghua meaning “The Chinese Nation”—an oddly jingoistic moniker for a pair of monkeys. Chinese government policies often blur the line between eugenics and education, lumped together as improving the “quality” (suzhi) of the population, which received another stamp of official endorsement following the recent Fourth Plenum. These programs are carried out through the country’s huge so-called family planning bureaucracy—originally established to enforce the one-child policy. Moreover, Beijing is increasingly extending its formidable social control apparatus into the realm of genetics. While there are considerable restrictions on private firms sharing biomedical data, largely because of an ugly history of popular discrimination against hepatitis carriers, the government has no such restrictions. A New York Times report earlier this year suggested, for example, that Chinese authorities had assembled a vast trove of genetic data on Chinese citizens without their consent, with the Uighur minority group having been specifically targeted.Beijing’s brand of bio-nationalism also directly threatens the United States. U.S. officials have been warning universities and research institutions that the biotech sector is a focal point for Chinese industrial espionage activities in the United States. And this past August, a senior Defense Department official warned Congress that China’s growing role in pharmaceutical manufacturing could allow it to disrupt deliveries of critical battlefield medicines, or potentially even alter them to harm U.S. forcesYet the biggest risks posed by biotech, for China, the United States, and other countries, pertain to nonstate actors. A critical feature of modern biotech, in contrast to technology like nuclear weapons, is that it’s cheap and easy to develop. A technique known as CRISPR, which the Chinese researcher He used in his illicit gene-editing work, makes it practical for just about anyone to manipulate the genomes of just about any organism they can lay their hands on. CRISPR makes it much simpler to skirt ethical restrictions and terrifyingly straightforward for terrorist groups to develop fearsome biological weapons. Researchers have already shown it’s possible to reconstruct the smallpox virus, which was eradicated in the real world in the 1970s, for as little as $200,000 using DNA fragments you can order online. If a terrorist or rogue state were to successfully do so, virtually no one alive would have any resistance to the virus—and most stockpiles of the vaccine were destroyed long ago. There is an organization, the International Gene Synthesis Consortium, that tries to screen suspicious orders for DNA fragments that might be used to build such bioweapons. And while most of the world’s major DNA synthesis firms belong to the consortium, membership is completely voluntary, and there’s also a thriving and entirely unregulated black market—much of it based in China.All of this means that biosecurity standards in places like China matter more than ever. After all, if a major bioweapon were to be unleashed, it’s unlikely that any major, globally integrated country could escape unharmed. Fortunately, there are growing signs China is open to better regulation of its biotech sector. In February, the Chinese government announced that “high risk” biomedical research would be overseen by the State Council, China’s equivalent of the cabinet—a sign of the concern with which Beijing views incidents like the He Jiankui CRISPR scandal. In a further sign of this concern, in August, the Chinese Communist Party announced the creation of a new committee to advise top leaders on research ethics. Government worry is matched by growing public concern within China. Opposition to genetically modified organisms is arguably stronger in China than in the West, and health concerns top the list of public issues. Rumors and panics largely center around health issues, especially after a series of vaccination scandals. That means that the government has to walk unusually carefully and offers plenty of scope to build ethical concerns into both law and practice. There are plenty of issues for U.S.-China cooperation on biotechnology and biosecurity to address. Given China’s role in the He Jiankui scandal, meanwhile, it would make sense to partner with the United States and other countries as part of a new World Health Organization effort to set international guidelines for the use of CRISPR. Another promising area of U.S.-China cooperation, especially in the research community, relates to so-called gene drives, the process of editing genomes and then spreading them through an entire population in just a few generations. Using gene drives to prevent select mosquito species from reproducing, for example, might finally banish the world of debilitating, widespread diseases such as malaria and Zika, while endangered species might be engineered to survive climate change.Microsoft founder Bill Gates once observed that “The world hasn’t had that many technologies that are both promising and dangerous. … We had nuclear weapons and nuclear energy.” But thanks in large part to the efforts of biomedical researchers in the United States and China, biotechnology is opening a similar Pandora’s box. And while the world has so far avoided nuclear war or conflict, it’s done so largely though efforts by governments, aided by the fact that nuclear technology is extremely difficult and expensive to master. The new wave of synthetic biology is exactly the opposite: It’s cheap to use and employ. For that very reason, while the U.S., Chinese, and other governments will be critical to dealing with the threat of new technologies, the discussions can’t be limited to nation-states. They’ll also have to gather together individual researchers, institutions, companies, and organizations like the International Gene Synthesis Consortium. When it comes to the risks posed by emerging technologies, Beijing, like Washington, will have to face the limits of its ability to solve the problem on its own.

#### China will leapfrog the US through biotech primacy

Cumbers 20 [John Cumbers, “I am the founder and CEO of SynBioBeta, the leading community of innovators, investors, engineers, and thinkers who share a passion for using synthetic biology to build a better, more sustainable universe. I publish the weekly SynBioBeta Digest, host the SynBioBeta Podcast, and wrote “What’s Your Biostrategy?”, the first book to anticipate how synthetic biology is going to disrupt virtually every industry in the world. I also founded BetaSpace, a space settlement innovation network and community of visionaries, technologists, and investors accelerating the industries needed to sustain human life here and off-planet. I’ve been involved with multiple startups, I am an operating partner and investor at the hard tech investment fund Data Collective, and I'm a former bioengineer at NASA. I earned my PhD in Molecular Biology, Cell Biology, and Biochemistry from Brown University and am originally from the UK.”) “China’s Plan To Beat The U.S. In The Trillion-Dollar Global Bioeconomy” Forbes, 2/3/2020] RM

The report, entitled “Safeguarding the Bioeconomy,” looks at how research and innovation in the life sciences is driving rapid growth in agriculture, biomedical science, information science and computing, energy, and other sectors of the U.S. economy. This economic activity—collectively referred to as the bioeconomy—presents many opportunities to create jobs, improve the quality of life, and continue to drive the U.S. economy as a whole. The report says that while the U.S. has been a leader in advancements in the biological sciences, other countries are actively investing in and expanding their capabilities in this area—and the U.S.’s lead is beginning to slip. Four reasons everyone should care about the U.S. bioeconomy It might be easy for some to dismiss the report out of hand as a bunch of alarmist professors lobbying for more research money. But when you consider all the ways that biotechnology powers the economy and impacts our daily lives, it becomes clear that this is about something more: The economy: at $1 trillion in value, the U.S. bioeconomy represents hundreds of thousands of quality, high-paying jobs for Americans. Health & medicine: innovators in the bioeconomy are making next-generation therapies for cancer and diabetes, tackling emerging diseases like Coronavirus, and even increasing human longevity. Food & farming: biotechnology is not only making agriculture more sustainable, it’s also bringing to market new and improved crops that are more nutritious, more affordable, and more delicious. The environment: humanity’s health and well-being depend on our ability to stop and reverse climate change, and we can’t do it without biological solutions that treat carbon not as a waste product, but as the starting point for chemicals and materials that today use petroleum. Considering all this, it doesn’t seem like an overstatement when the report authors say that U.S. competitiveness in the bioeconomy is key to maintaining the economic health and security of the country. The very real risks to the U.S. bioeconomy There are many things that can go wrong, causing the U.S. to lose its current edge in the global bioeconomy. Some of these are economic risks, and others present serious national security risks. All of them are related to a failure of our government to act now. Here’s a sampling of the risks to U.S. leadership at the frontiers of tech and bio: Insufficient government R&D investment. Money for basic research and development builds the foundations of the bioeconomy. We learn, achieve new results, and create new applications. Investments that help develop enabling tools, technologies, and standards have the potential to maintain the U.S. bioeconomy competitive in a global bioeconomy. Ineffective or inefficient regulations. Regulatory uncertainty stifles creative new approaches that may have unknown paths, long delays, or that might be prohibited by later changes. Inadequate workforce. The U.S.’s K-12 education system may not prepare students to study STEM subjects at the university and postgraduate level, hindering the quality of workers. A skilled workforce gives U.S. companies the best talent to choose from, and it also encourages international firms to establish research and production facilities here. Ineffective or inefficient intellectual property protections. Uncertainty over what is patentable could discourage innovators who are considering whether and how to bring their innovations to market. Patent eligibility is also important to venture capitalists and private equity investors when considering whether to invest in biotechnology companies. Cybersecurity. As biological engineering depends more and more on massive datasets, the emerging bioeconomy now exists at the intersection of information science and biotechnological science. The bioeconomy’s growing reliance on software, networking, and computer hardware tools yields the same cyber vulnerabilities present in any other sector, including hacking, sabotage, breached privacy, or theft of intellectual property. Biosafety and biosecurity risks. The tools of today’s bioeconomy are enabling new capabilities that can generate concerns regarding traditional biothreats. These can include the accidental or intentional creation or release of dangerous or lethal pathogens. Such biothreats can harm humans, animals, plants, agriculture, the environment, and materials. Risks from climate change. Food and feed crops, biofuels crops, and crops used with bio-based fermentation products are susceptible to temperature and water stresses, as well as insects and pathogens that migrate with changing weather patterns. China: the biotech elephant in the room I’ve written previously written how the Chinese government is already making substantial investments in its bioeconomy. Here are three scary statistics, courtesy of Greg B. Scott of the ChinaBio Group: China is out-investing the U.S. China’s private investors poured $14.4 billion into its bioeconomy in 2019. That compares to the United States’ more meager investment of $10.4 billion. China is building a bigger bioeconomy workforce. China graduates about 8-10 million students each year. In the U.S., that number is closer to 400,000. Many Chinese students graduating from U.S. institutions stay here, but they are increasingly returning home to start highly innovative companies. China is investing in itself. Historically, China has invested heavily in foreign companies, tech, and debt. Now we’re seeing an uptick in China-to-China investments—the country no longer needs to look abroad to find plenty of good biotech opportunities. Chinese investments have led to centers of excellence in the regional technology hub of Shenzhen, including the Institute of Synthetic Biology at the Shenzhen Institute of Advanced Sciences (SIAT) and BGI Genomics. Shenzhen will compete for technological and economic leadership with U.S. regional biotech powerhouses such as San Francisco/Silicon Valley and Boston/Cambridge in the years to come. Many of China’s long-standing challenges—environment, food, water, waste management, and rapid innovation to retain its global manufacturing competitiveness—are areas where synthetic biology is seen as a key technology for the future. In other words, synthetic biology is not just an academic pursuit for China. Rather, its leaders are thinking proactively about how biological engineering can be used to address the country’s strategic national interests—while U.S. leadership stands idly by. What do we do? So what can U.S. policymakers do to protect the U.S. bioeconomy and ensure continued technological and economic leadership in biology for the next twenty years? Straight from the top. China has made clear its ambition to become a global tech superpower, with President Xi Jinping calling science and technology one of the main battlefronts of the economy. The U.S. administration needs to step up its game, too. President Trump recently declared January 2020 to be National Biotechnology Month, citing “boundless possibilities for economic growth, national security, healthcare, manufacturing, and agriculture.” That’s the right sentiment—now we need real action. New legislation. Late last year, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Engineering Biology Research and Development Act of 2019, which would direct the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to implement a national research strategy for engineering biology. The explicit goal: maintain U.S. science, technology, and economic leadership in synthetic biology. The bill now resides in the Senate and awaits committee action. Legislative leadership is now needed to give this bill the appropriations necessary to give it real teeth, and then put it squarely on the President’s desk. Investing for returns. The Human Genome Project is said to have returned $141 for every dollar invested by taxpayers. While “Big Science” yields tremendous benefits for everyone, it doesn’t happen without federal funding. In 2019, politically courageous Republicans and Democrats came together to produce a 2020 final spending bill that is kind to science, in essence ignoring President Trump’s proposed cuts and instead giving increases to each of the NIH, NSF, NASA, and DOE’s Office of Science. But the U.S. isn’t even in the top ten for R&D spending as a percentage of GDP, while China continues to close in on the U.S., meaning that the U.S. is no longer the uncontested global leader in science. Leading the global bioeconomy: Have some courage There are many things the U.S. could do to protect the American bioeconomy. But above all else, policymakers need to come together and demonstrate the kind of courage and vision needed to be a world leader. Science and technology know no partisan lines. Everybody wants healthy lives, clean water, and good jobs. Federal initiative and assistance are needed to bring these benefits to everyone living in the U.S.. Today, the American synthetic biology industry may be unprepared for the global competition it will face, lacking initiative and leadership at the highest levels of government. But this could change quickly. If a country like the U.S. makes engineering biology a national priority, anything is possible in the new bioeconomy.

#### Heg solves arms races, land grabs, rogue states, and great power war

Brands 18 [Hal, Henry Kissinger Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies and a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments." American Grand Strategy in the Age of Trump." Page 129-133]

Since World War II, the United States has had a military second to none. Since the Cold War, America has committed to having overwhelming military primacy. The idea, as George W. Bush declared in 2002, that America must possess “strengths beyond challenge” has featured in every major U.S. strategy document for a quarter century; it has also been reflected in concrete terms.6 From the early 1990s, for example, the United States consistently accounted for around 35 to 45 percent of world defense spending and maintained peerless global power-projection capabilities.7 Perhaps more important, U.S. primacy was also unrivaled in key overseas strategic regions—Europe, East Asia, the Middle East. From thrashing Saddam Hussein’s million-man Iraqi military during Operation Desert Storm, to deploying—with impunity—two carrier strike groups off Taiwan during the China-Taiwan crisis of 1995– 96, Washington has been able to project military power superior to anything a regional rival could employ even on its own geopolitical doorstep. This military dominance has constituted the hard-power backbone of an ambitious global strategy. After the Cold War, U.S. policymakers committed to averting a return to the unstable multipolarity of earlier eras, and to perpetuating the more favorable unipolar order. They committed to building on the successes of the postwar era by further advancing liberal political values and an open international economy, and to suppressing international scourges such as rogue states, nuclear proliferation, and catastrophic terrorism. And because they recognized that military force remained the ultima ratio regum, they understood the centrality of military preponderance. Washington would need the military power necessary to underwrite worldwide alliance commitments. It would have to preserve substantial overmatch versus any potential great-power rival. It must be able to answer the sharpest challenges to the international system, such as Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990 or jihadist extremism after 9/11. Finally, because prevailing global norms generally reflect hard-power realities, America would need the superiority to assure that its own values remained ascendant. It was impolitic to say that U.S. strategy and the international order required “strengths beyond challenge,” but it was not at all inaccurate. American primacy, moreover, was eminently affordable. At the height of the Cold War, the United States spent over 12 percent of GDP on defense. Since the mid-1990s, the number has usually been between 3 and 4 percent.8 In a historically favorable international environment, Washington could enjoy primacy—and its geopolitical fruits—on the cheap. Yet U.S. strategy also heeded, at least until recently, the fact that there was a limit to how cheaply that primacy could be had. The American military did shrink significantly during the 1990s, but U.S. officials understood that if Washington cut back too far, its primacy would erode to a point where it ceased to deliver its geopolitical benefits. Alliances would lose credibility; the stability of key regions would be eroded; rivals would be emboldened; international crises would go unaddressed. American primacy was thus like a reasonably priced insurance policy. It required nontrivial expenditures, but protected against far costlier outcomes.9 Washington paid its insurance premiums for two decades after the Cold War. But more recently American primacy and strategic solvency have been imperiled. THE DARKENING HORIZON For most of the post–Cold War era, the international system was— by historical standards—remarkably benign. Dangers existed, and as the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, demonstrated, they could manifest with horrific effect. But for two decades after the Soviet collapse, the world was characterized by remarkably low levels of great-power competition, high levels of security in key theaters such as Europe and East Asia, and the comparative weakness of those “rogue” actors—Iran, Iraq, North Korea, al-Qaeda—who most aggressively challenged American power. During the 1990s, some observers even spoke of a “strategic pause,” the idea being that the end of the Cold War had afforded the United States a respite from normal levels of geopolitical danger and competition. Now, however, the strategic horizon is darkening, due to four factors. First, great-power military competition is back. The world’s two leading authoritarian powers—China and Russia—are seeking regional hegemony, contesting global norms such as nonaggression and freedom of navigation, and developing the military punch to underwrite these ambitions. Notwithstanding severe economic and demographic problems, Russia has conducted a major military modernization emphasizing nuclear weapons, high-end conventional capabilities, and rapid-deployment and special operations forces— and utilized many of these capabilities in conflicts in Ukraine and Syria.10 China, meanwhile, has carried out a buildup of historic proportions, with constant-dollar defense outlays rising from US$26 billion in 1995 to US$226 billion in 2016.11 Ominously, these expenditures have funded development of power-projection and antiaccess/area denial (A2/AD) tools necessary to threaten China’s neighbors and complicate U.S. intervention on their behalf. Washington has grown accustomed to having a generational military lead; Russian and Chinese modernization efforts are now creating a far more competitive environment.

## Case

### 1nc – counterfeiting

#### Patents are key to adequate regulation and testing of drugs -- AFF leads to rampant counterfeiting and unsafe medication, which threatens public health, kills most vulnerable patients, and causes narcotic/human trafficking to surge. Especially true now due to public desperation over COVID, rise in e-commerce, and expansion of substandard medicine manufacturers targeting critical life-saving drugs

IPKey 21 (IP Key – Run by EUIPO and the European Commission to provide news coverage and scientific knowledge concerning intellectual property rights, “Intellectual Property and Keeping Medicines Safe”, https://ipkey.eu/en/south-east-asia/news/intellectual-property-and-keeping-medicines-safe, 2 February 2021, EmmieeM)

If you are what you eat, and bad diets lead to bad health, imagine what unsafe medicines can do.

We ask today, why the provenance of vaccines has attracted so much attention when the origin of medicines we take, in some cases, every day and without even thinking, is not questioned at all? How do we know we can trust medicines readily available on the market from seemingly legitimate sources? Where does intellectual property (IP) come into all of this and why is a proper IP application and registration process important?

The global race to develop vaccines to fight the spread of COVID-19 has understandably captured the attention of the public worldwide. People of all generations and with little or no expertise in clinical trials have followed the process keenly, wishing and willing together that science can provide the answer to stopping the pandemic so what was called ‘normal’ life can return. This public interest has also rightly scrutinised the testing that is designed to make sure that these vaccines are safe and this same focus is thankfully putting medicines under the spotlight more broadly.

When we talk about medicines, they are universally understood to mean a drug or other preparation for the treatment or prevention of a disease or illness. In essence, they serve to keep us feeling healthy, or make us feel better. But what about when they achieve the exact opposite, when they are in fact harmful, or even fatal? The cause is usually because of fake and counterfeit medicines. This is because something they both have in common is the lack of rigorous inspections by public authorities that seek to guarantee the safety of medicines for widespread use.

What’s more, the proliferation of both kinds of these illegal medicines is worsened by a critical fact. Previously, they used to mainly be related to ‘lifestyle’ medicines, but now, even innovative or critical life-saving medicines, such as medicines that tackle cardiovascular diseases, are being increasingly created and are entering the market without official IP application and registration processes.

But if they are both illegal and both cause harm, what’s the difference between fake and counterfeit medicines? Fake medicines pass themselves off as real, authorised medicines but they may actually contain ingredients that are of low quality or in the wrong dosage. Since they have not passed through the necessary evaluation of quality, safety and efficacy as required by authorisation procedures, they can be a major health threat. Counterfeit medicines, in contrast, are those medicines that do not comply with intellectual and industrial property rights, such as registered trade marks or patent rights. But it is important to stress, this is not just an IP issue. In the vast majority of cases (90%) they can also be harmful to a patient’s health, according to a study recently released by the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) on ‘Trade in Counterfeit Pharmaceutical Products’. The World Health Organization (WHO) also shared in the 2017 report, ‘WHO Global Surveillance and Monitoring System for Substandard and Falsified Medical Products’, that the estimated number of children who may die from pneumonia each year after consuming counterfeit medicines is between 72 000 and 169 000.

But counterfeit medicines are not just a public health concern. Innovation and creativity are the cornerstones of modern economies and counterfeit medicines siphon off revenue that should justly have been earned by the rightful owners of the medicines that counterfeit medicines seek to imitate. Not just legal pharmaceutical companies are hurt. The public lose out on better and more effective medicines because less revenue can be dedicated to further research and development.

Worryingly, experience shows that these products are finding their way into the legal supply chains more easily than ever, meaning the sale of counterfeit medicines is not limited to illegal trading channels, such as illegal retailers or online sales. Instead, innocent consumers and desperate patients with life-threatening conditions can unwittingly purchase them and be completely ignorant of the potentially harmful side effects.

But the problem does not stop there, either. As highlighted by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime report, organised crime is often behind the production of counterfeit medicines, meaning their profits can be used to fuel other illicit trades of, for example, narcotics or even human trafficking practices that help perpetuate more violent crimes, including kidnappings and extortion.

This process has been aided in part by the boom in e-commerce. Technological advancements and the growing tendency to buy online, especially during the pandemic, have made regulation more difficult and helped increase the prevalence of counterfeit goods. These conditions create the perfect environment for non-regulated sellers and, rather than big shipments, the European Commission’s report on the EU customs enforcement of intellectual property rights indicates that courier and postal traffic accounted for 84% of all detentions of counterfeit goods generally in the EU.

But citizens can play a part in combating counterfeit medicines. Basic steps such as checking the origin of products or looking for stamps of authorities help, as does greater awareness of their existence. We must come together to fight them because counterfeit medicines have existed in the market now for a long time, and without sufficient awareness, consumption of these substances can lead to unexpected symptoms, permanent disabilities, and even loss of life.

### WTO Cred

#### Biden and trump terminally thump WTO cred

Anne O. Krueger 5-24 [(Anne O. Krueger, a former World Bank chief economist and former first deputy managing director of the International Monetary Fund, is Senior Research Professor of International Economics at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies and Senior Fellow at the Center for International Development at Stanford University.) “Biden's Trumpy Start on Trade” <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/bidens-trade-policy-is-a-lot-like-trumps-by-anne-o-krueger-2021-05>]TDI

WASHINGTON, DC – Former President Donald Trump did enormous damage to the United States’ reputation and future prospects, both domestically and internationally. Yet while President Joe Biden has set about reversing the previous administration’s legacy in many domains, he has yet to focus his attention on US trade policy. That needs to change. Trump’s trade policies were not only a disaster for US and world trade; they also have made it more difficult for the US to achieve a broader range of economic and foreign-policy goals. Reversing those policies thus should be a top priority for the new administration. After all, America’s friends and allies (particularly the European Union, the United Kingdom, Canada, Mexico, Japan, and South Korea) remain deeply shaken by Trump’s protectionist impulses. In addition to slapping tariffs on a broad range of goods, his administration forced a renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement and the US-Korea Free Trade Agreement, and withdrew the US from the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) to which the US had agreed. It declared a “trade war” with China, despite that country’s membership in the World Trade Organization (WTO), and with no regard for US trading partners’ own dealings with China. Taken together, these policies have done serious damage to America’s standing in the world. Leading the world toward an open multilateral trading system under the 1947 General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT, which became the WTO in 1995) was one of America’s crowning achievements after World War II. The system works precisely because members willingly commit themselves to open, rules-based trade policies. Among other things, this ensures that foreign traders have the same rights as domestic nationals when disputes between them arise, and that the principle of nondiscrimination among trading partners prevails, except in the case of preferential trading arrangements. Trade flourished under the GATT, with the US leading negotiations for multilateral tariff reductions and the removal of other trade barriers (including quantitative restrictions). In later years, developing countries witnessed the success of open markets and decided to start dismantling their own highly protectionist regimes. For most, this resulted in a remarkable acceleration of growth in output and trade. For more than a half-century, world trade grew roughly twice as fast as world GDP. This growth was far from smooth, of course. Significant slowdowns followed the oil shocks of the 1970s, the Asian financial crisis of the late 1990s, and the Great Recession a decade later. Growth in world output and trade has resumed since the 2008 global financial crisis, but not as rapidly as in the years preceding it. And China, following an overhaul of its trade policies in the 1990s and its accession to the WTO in 2001, emerged as the world’s largest trading power. In addition to reducing domestic poverty and improving living standards for its own population, China’s dramatic economic ascent was bound to raise issues with other countries. **But thanks to the WTO and its dispute-settlement mechanism, there was a multilateral forum where these issues could be addressed – that is, until Trump came along.** Although **Biden** has reasserted America’s commitment to internationalism and multilateralism, he **has moved slowly to repair the damage that Trump did to critical institutions like the WTO.** Nor has Biden reversed Trump’s withdrawal from the TPP. Now called the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, US membership in this 11-country pact would be a boon for US exporters. Currently, US companies are at a distinct disadvantage relative to their competitors in CPTPP countries, because their exports to those economies are subject to duties that do not apply to exports from members of the bloc. Biden also has not ended the trade war with China, even though that effort has utterly failed to achieve its stated objectives. While the US bilateral trade deficit with China has fallen somewhat, the deficits with Vietnam, Malaysia, and others have risen commensurately as their exports have replaced those from China. Although the Biden administration has finally agreed to a new director-general for the WTO, it has done little to reduce Trump’s tariffs, and has even announced that it will strengthen “buy American” provisions in government procurement contracts. Biden says he wants to protect American jobs, yet the Trump administration’s tariffs on imported iron and steel, which have cost a net total of around 75,000 jobs (leaving out the additional losses caused by other countries’ retaliatory tariffs), remain in place. If Biden really wants to help American workers, he should recognize that exports create good jobs, and that the export sector’s contribution to US GDP has doubled as a result of open multilateral trade. As for America’s current-account deficit, that can be addressed only by curtailing US expenditures relative to income, not through protectionism. And because the WTO procurement agreement has led other countries to open up government bidding processes for American exporters, it is doubtful that weakening it will benefit American workers; indeed, doing so may even cost jobs. China is here to stay. Though there are certainly trade issues that need to be addressed, that is best done multilaterally. The US and China have both lost as a result of the trade war. A US offer to remove the tariffs if the Chinese reciprocate and join multilateral discussions on outstanding issues could benefit both countries and the rest of the world. Strong economies make for successful countries. Efforts to protect domestic industries are a sign of weakness, not strength. If the Biden administration wants to achieve its stated goals, it will remove Trump’s protectionist measures, work multilaterally, strengthen US infrastructure, invest in workforce skills and education, and expand America’s research capabilities. **It should be obvious by now that continuing the last administration’s trade policies is a recipe for failure.**

#### Trade is irrelevant for war

Katherine Barbieri 13, Associate Professor of If the Biden administration wants to achieve its stated goals, it will remove Trump’s protectionist measures, work multilaterally, strengthen US infrastructure, invest in workforce skills and education, and expand America’s research capabilities. Political Science at the University of South Carolina, Ph.D. in Political Science from Binghamton University, “Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or Source of Interstate Conflict?” Chapter 10 in Conflict, War, and Peace: An Introduction to Scientific Research, google books

How does interdependence affect war, the most intense form of conflict? Table 2 gives the empirical results. The rarity of wars makes any analysis of their causes quite difficult, for variations in interdependence will seldom result in the occurrence of war. As in the case of MIDs, the log-likelihood ratio tests for each model suggest that the inclusion of the various measures of interdependence and the control variables improves our understanding of the factors affecting the occurrence of war over that obtained from the null model. However, the individual interdependence variables, alone, are not statistically significant. This is not the case with contiguity and relative capabilities, which are both statistically significant. Again, we see that contiguous dyads are more conflict-prone and that dyads composed of states with unequal power are more pacific than those with highly equal power. Surprisingly, no evidence is provided to support the commonly held proposition that democratic states are less likely to engage in wars with other democratic states.¶ The evidence from the pre-WWII period provides support for those arguing that economic factors have little, if any, influence on affecting leaders’ decisions to engage in war, but many of the control variables are also statistically insignificant. These results should be interpreted with caution, since the sample does not contain a sufficient number wars to allow us to capture great variations across different types of relationships. Many observations of war are excluded from the sample by virtue of not having the corresponding explanatory measures. A variable would have to have an extremely strong influence on conflict—as does contiguity—to find significant results. ¶ 7. Conclusions This study provides little empirical support for the liberal proposition that trade provides a path to interstate peace. Even after controlling for the influence of contiguity, joint democracy, alliance ties, and relative capabilities, the evidence suggests that in most instances trade fails to deter conflict. Instead, extensive economic interdependence increases the likelihood that dyads engage in militarized dispute; however, it appears to have little influence on the incidence of war.

### Pandemics

#### Limited manufacturing and poor distribution infrastructure outweigh

Khullar 21. [(Dhruv Khullar is a contributing writer at The New Yorker, where he writes primarily about medicine, health care, and politics. He is also a practicing physician and an assistant professor at Weill Cornell Medical College) “India’s Crisis Marks a New Phase in the Pandemic,” The New Yorker, May 13, 2021. <https://www.newyorker.com/science/medical-dispatch/indias-crisis-marks-a-new-phase-in-the-pandemic>] TDI

Jha told me that he **worries less about I.P.** and incentives than about the **practical obstacles to vaccine production.** The primary barriers to vaccine availability, he said, are not rigid intellectual-property protections but **limited manufacturing capacity and poor distribution infrastructure.** Only a **small number of companies** have the expertise needed to manufacture covid-19 vaccines, especially ones that use new mRNA technology, and **scaling up takes time.** “The world wasn’t ready to produce five or ten billion doses of covid vaccines,” Jha said. “We don’t just have all this excess capacity sitting around. You need raw materials, production capabilities, liner bags, a whole bunch of complex machinery and supplies.” Absent “a broader package of funding, supplies, manufacturing, and people with technical know-how,” Jha said, **waiving I.P. rights wouldn’t help India escape the crisis that it faces today.**