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#### Security is a psychological construct—the aff’s scenarios for conflict are products of paranoia only targeting the symptoms and project our violent impulses onto the other.

Mack ‘91\* [John Mack (Doctor of Psychiatry and a professor at Harvard University), “The Enemy System,” <http://www.johnemackinstitute.org/eJournal/article.asp?id=23>) \*Gender modified

The threat of nuclear annihilation has stimulated us to try to understand what it is about (hu)mankind that has led to such self-destroying behavior. Central to this inquiry is an exploration of the adversarial relationships between ethnic or national groups. It is out of such enmities that war, including nuclear war should it occur, has always arisen. Enmity between groups of people stems from the interaction of psychological, economic, and cultural elements. These include fear and hostility (which are often closely related), competition over perceived scarce resources,[3] the need for individuals to identify with a large group or cause,[4] a tendency to disclaim and assign elsewhere responsibility for unwelcome impulses and intentions, and a peculiar susceptibility to emotional manipulation by leaders who play upon our more savage inclinations in the name of national security or the national interest. A full understanding of the "enemy system"[3] requires insights from many specialities, including psychology, anthropology, history, political science, and the humanities. In their statement on violence[5] twenty social and behavioral scientists, who met in Seville, Spain, to examine the roots of war, declared that there was no scientific basis for regarding (hu)man(s) as an innately aggressive animal, inevitably committed to war. The Seville statement implies that we have real choices. It also points to a hopeful paradox of the nuclear age: threat of nuclear war may have provoked our capacity for fear-driven polarization but at the same time it has inspired unprecedented efforts towards cooperation and settlement of differences without violence. The Real and the Created Enemy Attempts to explore the psychological roots of enmity are frequently met with responses on the following lines: "I can accept psychological explanations of things, but my enemy is real. The Russians [or Germans, Arabs, Israelis, Americans] are armed, threaten us, and intend us harm. Furthermore, there are real differences between us and our national interests, such as competition over oil, land, or other scarce resources, and genuine conflicts of values between our two nations. It is essential that we be strong and maintain a balance or superiority of military and political power, lest the other side take advantage of our weakness". This argument does not address the distinction between the enemy threat and one's own contribution to that threat-by distortions of perception, provocative words, and actions. In short, the enemy is real, but we have not learned to understand how we have created that enemy, or how the threatening image we hold of the enemy relates to its actual intentions. "We never see our enemy's motives and we never labor to assess his will, with anything approaching objectivity".[6] Individuals may have little to do with the choice of national enemies. Most Americans, for example, know only what has been reported in the mass media about the Soviet Union. We are largely unaware of the forces that operate within our institutions, affecting the thinking of our leaders and ourselves, and which determine how the Soviet Union will be represented to us. Ill-will and a desire for revenge are transmitted from one generation to another, and we are not taught to think critically about how our assigned enemies are selected for us. In the relations between potential adversarial nations there will have been, inevitably, real grievances that are grounds for enmity. But the attitude of one people towards another is usually determined by leaders who manipulate the minds of citizens for domestic political reasons which are generally unknown to the public. As Israeli sociologist Alouph Haveran has said, in times of conflict between nations historical accuracy is the first victim.[8] The Image of the Enemy and How We Sustain It Vietnam veteran William Broyles wrote: "War begins in the mind, with the idea of the enemy."[9] But to sustain that idea in war and peacetime a nation's leaders must maintain public support for the massive expenditures that are required. Studies of enmity have revealed susceptibilities, though not necessarily recognized as such by the governing elites that provide raw material upon which the leaders may draw to sustain the image of an enemy.[7,10] Freud[11] in his examination of mass psychology identified the proclivity of individuals to surrender personal responsibility to the leaders of large groups. This surrender takes place in both totalitarian and democratic societies, and without coercion. Leaders can therefore designate outside enemies and take actions against them with little opposition. Much further research is needed to understand the psychological mechanisms that impel individuals to kill or allow killing in their name, often with little questioning of the morality or consequences of such actions. Philosopher and psychologist Sam Keen asks why it is that in virtually every war "The enemy is seen as less than human? He's faceless. He's an animal"." Keen tries to answer his question: "The image of the enemy is not only the soldier's most powerful weapon; it is society's most powerful weapon. It enables people en masse to participate in acts of violence they would never consider doing as individuals".[12] National leaders become skilled in presenting the adversary in dehumanized images. The mass media, taking their cues from the leadership, contribute powerfully to the process.

#### We must resist the urge to ideologically support mass violence. It recreates the AFF’s harms and culminates in nuclear war.

John Collins, Assistant Professor of Global Studies at St. Lawrence University, and Ross Glover, Visiting Professor of Sociology at St. Lawrence University, **2002** (Collateral Language, p. 6-7)

The Real Effects of Language As any university student knows, theories about the “social con­struction” and social effects of language have become a common feature of academic scholarship. Conservative critics often argue that those who use these theories of language (e.g., deconstruc­tion) are “just” talking about language, as opposed to talking about the “real world.” The essays in this book, by contrast, begin from the premise that language matters in the most concrete, im­mediate way possible: its use, by political and military leaders, leads directly to violence in the form of war, mass murder (in­cluding genocide), the physical destruction of human commu­nities, and the devastation of the natural environment. Indeed, if the world ever witnesses a nuclear holocaust, it will probably be because leaders in more than one country have succeeded in convincing their people, through the use of political language, that the use of nuclear weapons and, if necessary, the destruction of the earth itself, is justifiable. From our perspective, then, every act of political violence—from the horrors perpetrated against Native Americans to the murder of political dissidents in the So­viet Union to the destruction of the World Trade Center, and now the bombing of Afghanistan—is intimately linked with the use of language. Partly what we are talking about here, of course, are the processes of “manufacturing consent” and shaping people’s per­ception of the world around them; people are more likely to sup­port acts of violence committed in their name if the recipients of the violence have been defined as “terrorists,” or if the violence is presented as a defense of “freedom.” Media analysts such as Noam Chomsky have written eloquently about the corrosive ef­fects that this kind of process has on the political culture of sup­posedly democratic societies. At the risk of stating the obvious, however, the most fundamental effects of violence are those that are visited upon the objects of violence; the language that shapes public opinion is the same language that burns villages, besieges entire populations, kills and maims human bodies, and leaves the ground scarred with bomb craters and littered with land mines. As George Orwell so famously illustrated in his work, acts of vio­lence can easily be made more palatable through the use of eu­phemisms such as “pacification” or, to use an example discussed in this book, “targets.” It is important to point out, however, that the need for such language derives from the simple fact that the violence itself is abhorrent. Were it not for the abstract language of “vital interests” and “surgical strikes” and the flattering lan­guage of “civilization” and ‘just” wars, we would be less likely to avert our mental gaze from the physical effects of violence.

#### Don’t believe in traditional risk assessment—it creates a state of perpetual insecurity that causes error replication and extinction.

Hagmann and Cavelty ‘12 [Jonas (senior researcher at the Center for Security Studies, lecturer at the Department of Humanities, Social and Political Sciences, ETH Zürich, holds a Doctorate and an MA in International Relations from the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies in Geneva) and Mryiam Dunn (lecturer for security studies and a senior researcher in the field of risk and resilience at the Center for Security Studies, PhD, studied International Relations, History, and International Law at the University of Zurich), 2/15/2012, "National risk registers: Security scientism and the propagation of permanent insecurity," Security Dialogue 43(1), Sage]

Risk registers’ adoption of conventional risk-assessment methodology – the formula that defines risk as likelihood multiplied by impact – also has a distinct influence on how insecurity is to be understood and handled. On the one hand, the emphasis on ‘likelihood’ initiates a consequential rationalization of danger occurrence. This rationalization, of course, is geared towards forecasting future developments. It is methodologically grounded in an in-depth analysis of danger’s ‘natural’ patterns of manifestation. As already mentioned, existing datasets and historical case studies are central elements in the identification of these patterns. The rationalization of risks based on past events is analytically efficacious, given that it empowers a projection of the past into the future. There is an implicit argument in the methodological measurement of ‘likelihood’ to the effect that the future essentially emulates history – the risk themes described in risk registers are extrapolations of misfortunes already experienced (Bigo, 2007; Jasanoff, 2009). Focusing on these risk themes, then, not only means focusing on past insecurities. It also means that, as technologies, risk registers project the very same insecurities into the future. With this, the very variable of ‘likelihood’ empowers an inert view of reality. This is problematic in the case of those risks that openly rely on, or are mediated by, social actors. Social actors are capable of adopting new types of behaviour over time. The risk of terrorism, for instance, can only be regarded as a persistent one under the assumption that terrorists will never cease, or be induced to cease, their activities. Given their commitment to engineering and econometric risk-assessment methodology, then, risk registers advance a regularized assessment of future practices. They leave little room for contingency, change and alternative trajectories, and so they tend to project a rather fatalist account of public insecurity. Another effect then adds to this projection. The reliance on past experiences as proof of the existence of risks negates the need to test their current viability. There is no requirement to prove that these issues will ever ‘actually’ become relevant in the future. Together with risk registers’ reliance on probability syllogisms, this causes these projected risks to gain a very specific kind of traction in the present. As risks are claimed to exist, but their date and place of materialization are held impossible to predict, a sense of comprehensive and ever-present insecurity is created. Insecurity comes to be regarded as substantial if not all-encompassing, always present and always possible – an understanding that directly caters to the permanent mobilization of a comprehensive kind of security dispositif. On the other hand, the focus on ‘impact’ as a determinant of risks also implies larger analytical claims. The problem here is the intimate focus of risk registers on damaging effects as such. The focus on material damage and financial costs in particular raises difficult questions as to what kinds of harmful effects can be claimed to be relevant to human beings and political collectives. In the risk registers, this question is simply delegated to the underlying risk formula. There are no selection criteria underlying risk registers other than a cost–benefit rationale, which comes into play when everything that seemed relevant to experts is compared by its calculated magnitude in the risk matrix. Another problematic aspect is the fact that while analyses of quantities of harm reveal a lot about damage, such an approach is of limited use in understanding how public dangers are created in the first place. The classic lines of enquiry in risk assessment are: ‘What can go wrong? What is the likelihood of it going wrong? What are the consequences if it goes wrong?’ (Haimes, 1998: 54–5). This means that risk assessments do not ask why something can go wrong, or how one’s own actions might be complicit in engendering such dangers. The focus on risk as harmful ‘impact’, then, not only implies debatable assumptions about relevant measures. Its focus on the consequences of risks and ignorance of their origins also poses limits to the reflexivity with which risks are approached.

#### Vote negative to interrogate cycles of enemy creation and reframe risk to a focus on the real toward systemic probability impacts instead of a race to infinite magnitudes—this can create a fissure in dominant narratives that make war inevitable.

Byles ‘3\* English, U Cyprus (Joanna, Psychoanalysis and War: The Superego and Projective Identification, <http://www.clas.ufl.edu/ipsa/journal/articles/art_byles01.shtml>) \*bracketed for gendered language

It is here of course that language plays an important role in imagining the other, the other within the self, and the other as self, as well as the enormously influential visual images each group can have of the other. In the need to emphasize similarity in difference, both verbal and visual metaphor can play a meaningful role in creating a climate for peaceful understanding, and this is where literature, especially the social world of the drama and of film, but also the more private world of poetry, can be immensely significant. Of course not all literature is equally transparent. In conclusion, war, in all its manifestations, is a phenomenon put into action by individuals who have been politicized as a group to give and receive violent death, to appropriate the enemy's land, homes, women, children, and goods, and perhaps to lose their own. As we have seen, in wartime the splitting of the self and other into friend and enemy enormously relieves the normal psychic tension caused by human ambivalence when love and hate find two separate objects of attention. Hence the .soldier's and terrorist's willingness to sacrifice her/his life for "a just cause," which may be a Nation, a Group, or a Leader with whom he has close emotional ties and identity. I n this way s/he does not feel guilty: the destructive impulses, mobilised by her/his own superego, together with that of the social superego, have projected the guilt s/he might feel at killing strangers onto the enemy. In other words, the charging of the enemy with guilt by which the superego of the State mobilizes the individual's superego seems to be of fundamental importance in escaping the sense of guilt which war provokes in those engaged in the killing; yet the mobilization of superego activities can still involve the individual's self-punitive mechanisms, even though most of his/her guilt has been projected onto the enemy in the name of his own civilization and culture. As we all know, this guilt can become a problem at the end of a war, leading to varying degrees of misery and mental illness. For some, the killing of an enemy and a stranger cannot be truly mourned, and there remains a blank space, an irretrievable act or event to be lived through over and over again. This dilemma is poignantly expressed in Wilfred Owen's World War One poem "Strange Meeting" the final lines of which read as follows: I am the enemy you killed, my friend. I knew you in this dark: for so you frowned Yesterday through me as you jabbed and killed. I parried; but my hands were loath and cold. Let us sleep now. ... (Owen 126) The problem for us today is how to create the psychological climate of opinion, a mentality, that will reject war, genocide, and terrorism as viable solutions to internal and external situations of conflict; to recognize our projections for what they are: dangerously irresponsible psychic acts based on superego hatred and violence. We must challenge the way in which the State superego can manipulate our responses in its own interests, even take away our subjectivities. We should acknowledge and learn to displace the violence in ourselves in socially harmless ways, getting rid of our fears and anxieties of the other and of difference by relating and identifying with the other and thus creating the serious desire to live together in a peaceful world. What seems to be needed is for the superego to regain its developmental role of mitigating omniscient protective identification by ensuring an intact, integrated object world, a world that will be able to contain unconscious fears, hatred, and anxieties without the need for splitting and projection. As Bion has pointed out, omnipotence replaces thinking and omniscience replaces learning. We must learn to link our internal and external worlds so as to act as a container of the other's fears and anxieties, and thus in turn to encourage the other to reciprocate as a container of our hatreds and fears. If war represents cultural formations that in turn represent objectifications of the psyche via the super-ego of the individual and of the State, then perhaps we can reformulate these psychic social mechanisms of projection and superego aggression. Here, that old peace-time ego and the reparative component of the individual and State superego will have to play a large part. The greater the clash of cultural formations for example, Western Modernism and Islamic Fundamentalism the more urgent the need. "The knowledge now most worth having" is an authentic way of internalizing what it is we understand about war and international terrorism that will liberate us from the history of our collective traumatic past and the imperatives it has imposed on us. The inner psychic world of the individual has an enormously important adaptive role to play here in developing mechanisms of protective identification not as a means of damaging and destroying the other, but as a means of empathy, of containing the other, and in turn being contained. These changes may be evolutionary rather than revolutionary, gradual rather than speedy. Peace and dare I say it contentment are not just an absence of war, but a state of mind. Furthermore, we should learn not to project too much into our group, and our nation, for this allows the group to tyrannize us, so that we follow like lost sheep. But speaking our minds takes courage because groups do not like open dissenters. These radical psychic changes may be evolutionary rather than revolutionary, gradual rather than speedy; however, my proposition that understanding the other so that we can reduce ~~her/his~~ [[their]] motivation to kill requires urgent action. Peace is not just an absence of war, but a state of mind and, most importantly, a way of thinking.

### CP

#### CP Text: The United States Congress should establish a new subcommittee to submit recommendations to Congress for the reduction of IPPs on medical diagnostics.

#### Congress will allow 60 days to pass legislation overriding recommendations by a two-thirds majority. If Congress doesn’t vote within the specified period, those recommendations will become law. The commission should recommend to Congress that the United States should do the [plan].

#### The counterplan is grounded in history----also proves that it will pass and doesn’t cause congressional fights

Mayer ’07(Kenneth,- professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin, Madison “THE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE PROCESS: IS IT POSSIBLE TO MAKE RATIONAL POLICY?”)

**The conventional wisdom was that legislators, facing increasing deficits and** budget rules that were **about to force the question of spending cuts, were searching for a solution** to the collective dilemma framed by the base structure. **There was broad consensus that something had to be done**, and fewer and fewer members were willing to defend the roadblocks that in practice made it impossible to close anything. **The solution** -- given shape by Representative Richard Armey (R-Texas) – **was to *separate the process*** into two parts: the first was the a decision to ratify the principle of base closing **and establish a mechanism by which specific choices would be made**. The second was the binding nature of that process, **in which legislators *gave up their power to amend*** the final list of closures. **Breaking up the process into two separate decisions created *substantial political cover*, insulating** the affected **members from the consequences** of a local base closing, **and insuring that no legislator was *directly connected* to a *specific vote*** to close a base. A few legislators criticized the proposal, with some making half-hearted defenses of old-school logrolling, others objecting to the refusal to consider closing foreign bases, and others because they foresaw that their own installations would probably be on the list. The binding character of the recommended closures was key. Once the president had approved the commission recommendations, Congress had 45 days to reject the list by a Joint Resolution, **under expedited procedures** designed to **minimize obstructionist tactics** (Davis 2005). **In practice, the process was *unstoppable*** after this stage, since **it would take 2/3 majorities** in both the House and Senate **to** actually **block the closures from going into effect** (assuming that resolution of disapproval would have to overcome a presidential veto). Resolutions of disapproval were duly introduced, but the floor debates all had the same character: members representing districts where a major closure occurred would rail against the process, insisting that the methodologies were flawed, that their bases made a critical contribution to national defense, that it was all about politics, that the closures disrespected military personnel, that the law was violated.8 **Members** knew that their **efforts were futile**, but the chance to object played a crucial symbolic function, providing members with vital position taking opportunities. **No**ne of the **disapproval resolutions came *anywhere close* to passing**.

### CP(TAKE OUT IF INAPPLICABLE)

#### **Text—The member nations of the World Trade Organization except the United States of America ought to reduce intellectual property protections on medical diagnostics.**

#### 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.

### DA

Biden PC key to solving drug pricing controls – will pass now but congress will slow it down bc of big pharma debate –

Impacts

Lack of drug price controls 🡪 issue of healthcare – econ collapse

#### 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.

Interp: New, undisclosed affs are a voting issue

Refusing to disclose the strategy before the round kills all form of clash that happen in the round and the amount of prep we can put into a strategy – causes a race to generics that kills education and prevents us from engaging in the affs \_\_\_\_
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#### 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. forces

Yet 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.

### 1NC – AT: Superbugs

#### Either they cant solve or no impact.

Fikes 17 – U-T San Diego's biotechnology reporter; covered the industry since 1990, internally cites study by authors from Harvard Medical School [Bradley J., 5/11/2017, “Long before the dinosaurs, antibiotic-resistant superbugs thrived”, The San Diego Union-Tribune, <http://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/business/biotech/sd-me-antibiotic-resistance-20170511-story.html>] AMarb

There’s a good reason why antibiotic-resistant bacteria are so tough, and it has less to do with humans than previously thought, according to a new study. A class of bacteria containing particularly troublesome superbugs that today plague hospitals dates back at least 425 to 450 million years, according to a team of Massachusetts researchers. Called enterococci, these hardy bacteria have endured several mass extinctions, including the Permian catastrophe of about 252 million years ago that destroyed nearly all species, including the trilobites. They survived the extinction of non-avian dinosaurs at the end of the Cretaceous without missing a beat. Using genetic techniques to track the diversification of enterococci, the researchers found that this group dates back to the time when animals first left the water for land. Moreover, their divergence also matched the emergence of new animal species, especially after the Permian extinction. The implication for those fighting superbugs is that antibiotic resistance is part of a survival toolkit that has been baked into their DNA for hundreds of millions of years. Overcoming everything Mother Nature could throw at them, these ancient bacteria are well-equipped to handle antibiotics and other means of controlling them that humans can devise. “Enterococci are distinguished from their ancestors and appear to have been selected for, by virtue of having developed a hardened cell wall and the ability to cope with environmental stress —traits that now render them resistant to denaturing solvents, disinfectants, and intrinsically, to many antibiotics,” the study concluded. “These are exactly the traits that enable them to persist in the modern hospital environment. Thus, the emergence of enterococci as leading hospital pathogens appears to have been foreordained by events of at least 425 mya.”

#### Antibiotic use in live-stock overwhelms.

#### ABR is not a threat – intervening actors solve.

Ed Cara 17. Science writer for The Atlantic, Newsweek, and Vocativ. “The Attack of The Superbugs.” Vocativ. <http://www.vocativ.com/394419/attack-of-the-superbugs/>.

Antibiotic-resistant infections kill at least 700,000 people worldwide a year right now, according to an exhaustive report commissioned by the UK in 2014, and without any substantial medical breakthroughs or policy changes that slow down resistance, they may claim some 10 million deaths annually by 2050 — eclipsing cancer in general as a leading cause. These deaths largely won’t come from pan-resistant infections, just tougher ones. A preventable death there, a preventable death here.

Leaving that aside, antibiotics, along with proper sanitation and nutrition, gird our entire way of living. Most every invasive surgery, pregnancy, organ transplant and chemotherapy session we go through will become riskier. Other diseases like HIV, malaria or influenza will become deadlier, since bacteria often exploit the opening in our immune system they leave behind. And already precarious populations like those living with cystic fibrosis, prisoners, and the poor will lose years off their lives.

For all the warranted gloom, though, Farewell does think there are reasons to be hopeful. “I don’t think we are doing enough, but the scientific community along with many governmental and private foundations are very actively involved in finding not only new antibiotics, but new solutions