# CP – Abolish WTO

## CP

### 1NC Text

#### Text:

#### 1. The World Trade Organization ought to be abolished.

#### 2. The following 164 countries listed in the speech doc ought to independently and without influence from international government [opponent’s plan]

Afghanistan

Albania

Angola

Antigua and Barbuda

Argentina

Armenia

Australia

Austria

Bahrain, Kingdom of

Bangladesh

Barbados

Belgium

Belize

Benin

Bolivia, Plurinational State of

Botswana

Brazil

Brunei Darussalam

Bulgaria

Burkina Faso

Burundi

Cabo Verde

Cambodia

Cameroon

Canada

Central African Republic

Chad

Chile

China

Colombia

Congo

Costa Rica

Côte d’Ivoire

Croatia

Cuba

Cyprus

Czech Republic

Democratic Republic of the Congo

Denmark

Djibouti

Dominica

Dominican Republic

Ecuador

Egypt

El Salvador

Estonia

Eswatini

European Union (formerly EC)

Fiji

Finland

France

Gabon

Gambia

Georgia

Germany

Ghana

Greece

Grenada

Guatemala

Guinea

Guinea-Bissau

Guyana

Haiti

Honduras

Hong Kong, China

Hungary

Iceland

India

Indonesia

Ireland

Israel

Italy

Jamaica

Japan

Jordan

Kazakhstan

Kenya

Korea, Republic of

Kuwait, the State of

Kyrgyz Republic

Lao People’s Democratic Republic

Latvia

Lesotho

Liberia

Liechtenstein

Lithuania

Luxembourg

Macao, China

Madagascar

Malawi

Malaysia

Maldives

Mali

Malta

Mauritania

Mauritius

Mexico

Moldova, Republic of

Mongolia

Montenegro

Morocco

Mozambique

Myanmar

Namibia

Nepal

Netherlands

New Zealand

Nicaragua

Niger

Nigeria

North Macedonia

Norway

Oman

Pakistan

Panama

Papua New Guinea

Paraguay

Peru

Philippines

Poland

Portugal

Qatar

Romania

Russian Federation

Rwanda

Saint Kitts and Nevis

Saint Lucia

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

Samoa

Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of

Senegal

Seychelles

Sierra Leone

Singapore

Slovak Republic

Slovenia

Solomon Islands

South Africa

Spain

Sri Lanka

Suriname

Sweden

Switzerland

Chinese Taipei

Tajikistan

Tanzania

Thailand

Togo

Tonga

Trinidad and Tobago

Tunisia

Turkey

Uganda

Ukraine

United Arab Emirates

United Kingdom

United States

Uruguay

Vanuatu

Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of

Viet Nam

Yemen

Zambia

Zimbabwe

Hawley, senator, JD Yale, 20

(Josh, 5-5, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/05/opinion/hawley-abolish-wto-china.html)

The coronavirus emergency is not only a public health crisis. With [30 million Americans unemployed](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/04/30/us-weekly-jobless-claims.html), it is also an economic crisis. And it has exposed a hard truth about the modern global economy: it weakens American workers and has empowered China’s rise. That must change. The global economic system as we know it is a relic; it requires reform, top to bottom. We should begin with one of its leading institutions, the World Trade Organization. We should abolish it.

### 1NC Colonialism

#### The WTO as an institution is unethical and perpetuates colonialism

Godrej 20

(Dinyar, Co-editor @ New Internationalist, 4-20, https://newint.org/features/2020/02/10/brief-history-impoverishment)

For countries that were undergoing economic ravishment by structural adjustment, the 1990s brought new torments in the form of the World Trade Organization (WTO), a club dominated by rich nations. In the name of creating a ‘level playing field’, the WTO required poorer countries to sign up to an all-or-nothing, binding set of rules, which removed protections for domestic industries and allowed foreign capital unhindered access. This was strongly prejudicial to the interests of local industries, which were not in a position to withstand foreign competition. Influence within the WTO is weighted by the size of a nation’s economy – thus even if all poorer nations joined forces to demand policy changes they would still not have a chance against wealthy nations. This trade injustice has drawn widespread protests and pressure for the WTO to reform. Meanwhile, wealthy nations are increasingly going down the route of bilateral Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). Usually negotiated in secret, the interests of their corporations are paramount in FTAs and include the ability to sue states for eye-watering sums (should they, for example, want to terminate a contract or nationalize an industry) with no provision for states to do the same. Such instruments are working to create a utopia for transnational corporations, creating a business-friendly climate, which translates as the demolition of labour protection, tax cuts for the wealthiest and a supine regulatory environment. Tax havens operated by the richest countries are home to huge sums of illicit wealth draining out of some of the poorest. Today, due to how the global economy has been engineered, for every dollar of aid sent to poorer countries, they lose 10 times as much in outflows – and that’s before one counts their losses through unfair trade rules and underpaid labour. Foreign investors take nearly $500 billion a year in profits from the Global South, and trade-power imbalances cost poorer nations $700 billion a year in lost export revenue. 7 CONCENTRATION In the 21st century wealth increasingly flows through corporate hands towards a small super-elite. In a trend that began in the 1990s, the lion’s share of equity value is being realized through squeezing workers: the classification ‘working poor’ so familiar in the Global South is now increasingly also being used in the wealthy North, where neoliberal capitalism is leading inevitably to wage erosion and work precarity, coupled with the withdrawal of state support. Inequality is rising dramatically. In 2018 the richest 26 people owned wealth equivalent to the poorest half of the world’s population. And their wealth was increasing at the rate of $2.5 billion a day. Meanwhile 3.4 billion people – nearly half the world – were living on less than $5.50 a day.

### 1NC Heg Bad

#### Eliminating the WTO ends U.S. global hegemony, as the US tries to control the rest of the world

Bello, PhD, 2000

(Walden, Sociology @ Stanford, https://users.ox.ac.uk/~magd1352/ecologist/Should%20WTO%20be%20abolished.pdf)

The idea that the world needs the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is one of the biggest lies of our time. The WTO came about, in 1995, mainly because it was in the interest of the US and its corporations. The European Union, Japan and especially the developing countries were mostly ambivalent about the idea; it was the US which drove it on. Why? Because though the US, back in 1948, blocked the formation of an International Trade Organisation (ITO), believing that, at that time, the interests of its corporations would not be served by such a global body, it had changed its mind by the 1990s. Now it wanted an international trade body. Why? Because its global economic dominance was threatened. The flexible GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) system, which preceded the WTO, had allowed the emergence of Europe and East Asia as competing industrial centres that threatened US dominance even in many high-tech industries. Under GATT’s system of global agricultural trade, Europe had emerged as a formidable agricultural power even as Third World governments concerned with preserving their agriculture and rural societies limited the penetration of their markets by US agricultural products. In other words, before the WTO, global trade was growing by leaps and bounds, but countries were using trade policy to industrialise and adapt to the growth of trade so that their economies would be enhanced by global trade and not be marginalised by it. That was a problem, from the US point of view. And that was why the US needed the WTO. The essence of the WTO is seen in three of its central agreements: the Agreement on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), the Agreement on Agriculture (AOA), and the Agreement on Trade Related Investment Measures (TRIMs). The purpose of TRIPs is not to promote free trade but to enhance monopoly power. One cannot quarrel with the fact that innovators should have preferential access to the benefits that flow from their innovation for a period of time. TRIPs, however, goes beyond this to institutionalise a monopoly for high-tech corporate innovators, most of them from the North. Among other things, TRIPs provides a generalised minimum patent protection of 20 years; institutes draconian border regulations against products judged to be violating intellectual property rights; and – contrary to the judicial principle of presuming innocence until proven guilty – places the burden of proof on the presumed violator of process patents. What TRIPs does is reinforce the monopolistic or oligopolistic position of US high tech firms such as Microsoft and Intel. It makes industrialisation by imitation or industrialisation via loose conditions of technology transfer – a strategy employed by the US, Germany, Japan, and South Korea during the early phases of their industrialisation – all but impossible. It enables the technological leader, in this case the US, to greatly influence the pace of technological and industrial development in the rest of the world.

#### Primacy causes endless war, terror, authoritarianism, prolif, and Russia-China aggression.

Ashford, PhD, 19

(Emma, PoliSci@UVA, Fellow@CATO, Power and Pragmatism: Reforming American Foreign Policy for the 21st Century, in New Voices in Grand Strategy, 4, CNAS)

Humility is a virtue. Yet in the last quarter century, American policymakers have been far more likely to embrace the notion of America as the “indispensable nation,” responsible for protecting allies, promoting democracy and human rights, tamping down conflicts, and generally managing global affairs. Compare this ideal to the U.S. track record – endless Middle Eastern wars, the rise of ISIS, global democratic backsliding, a revanchist Russia, resurgent China, and a world reeling from the election of President Donald Trump – and this label seems instead the height of hubris. Many of the failures of U.S. foreign policy speak for themselves. As the daily drumbeat of bad news attests, interventions in Iraq and Libya were not victories for human rights or democracy, but rather massively destabilizing for the Middle East as a whole. Afghanistan – despite initial military successes – has become a quagmire, highlighting the futility of nation- building. Other failures of America’s grand strategy are less visible, but no less damaging. NATO expansion into Eastern Europe helped to reignite hostility between Russia and the West. Worse, it has diluted the alliance’s defensive capacity and its democratic character. And even as the war on terror fades from public view, it remains as open-ended as ever: Today, the United States is at war in seven countries and engaged in “combating terrorism’ in more than 80.1 To put it bluntly: America’s strategy since the end of the Cold War – whether it is called primacy or liberal internationalism – may not be a total failure, but it has not been successful either. Many have tried to place blame for these poor outcomes.2 But recrimination is less important than understanding why America’s strategy has failed so badly and avoiding these mistakes in future. Much of the explanation is the natural outcome of changing constraints. Iraq and Libya should not be viewed as regrettable anomalies, but rather the logical outcome of unipolarity and America’s liberal internationalist inclination to solve every global problem. It’s also a reliance on flawed assumptions – that what is good for America is always good for the world, for example. Support for dangerous sovereignty-undermining norms adds to the problem; just look at the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), which has proved not to protect populations or stabilize fragile states, but to provoke chaos, encourage nuclear proliferation, and undermine the international institutions. Perhaps, if nothing else had changed, a form of watered-down liberal internationalism that foreswore interventionism and drew back from the war on terror might have been possible.3 But international politics are undergoing a period of profound transformation, from unipolarity to regional or even global multipolarity. Primacy – and the consistent drumbeat of calls in Washington to do more, always and everywhere – is neither sustainable nor prudent. Nor can we fall back on warmed-over Cold War–era strategies better suited to an era of bipolar superpower competition.

# Hammerhead CP

## 1NC

#### CP text: The member nations of the WTO ought to drastically increase protections for the Scalloped Hammerhead Shark

#### The Scalloped and Great Hammerhead are critically endangered – any increase in demand for their highly valued liver oil (squalene) means extinction

Briggs 1/27/21

Helen Briggs (BBC science correspondent, but the study in this article is from the journal, “Nature”), 1/27/2021 "Extinction: 'Time is running out' to save sharks and rays," BBC News, [https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-55830732 //](https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-55830732%20//) AW

Scientists say sharks and rays are disappearing from the world's oceans at an "alarming" rate. The number of sharks found in the open oceans has plunged by 71% over half a century, mainly due to over-fishing, according to a new study. Three-quarters of the species studied are now threated with extinction. And the researchers say immediate action is needed to secure a brighter future for these "extraordinary, irreplaceable animals". They are calling on governments to implement science-based fishing limits. Study researcher, Dr Richard Sherley of the University of Exeter, said the declines appear to be driven very much by fishing pressures. He told BBC News: "That's the driver for the 70% reduction in the last 50 years. For every 10 sharks you had in the open ocean in the 1970s, you would have three today, across these species, on average." Sharks and rays are caught for their meat, fins and liver oil. They are also captured for recreational fishing and turn up by accident in the catch of fishing boats that are targeting other stocks. image caption Sharks are long-lived species that tend to produce few young Of the 31 species studied, 24 are now threatened with extinction, and three shark species (the oceanic whitetip shark, and the scalloped and great hammerhead sharks) have declined so sharply they are now classified as critically endangered - the highest threat category, according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). Prof Nicholas Dulvy of Simon Fraser University in British Columbia, Canada, said oceanic sharks and rays are at exceptionally high risk of extinction, much more so than the average bird, mammal or frog, despite ranging far from land. "Overfishing of oceanic sharks and rays jeopardises the health of entire ocean ecosystems as well as food security for some of the world's poorest countries," he said. 'Wake-up call' The researchers compiled global data on sharks and rays found in the open oceans (as opposed to reef sharks or those found close to shore). Of the 1,200 or so species of sharks and rays in the world, 31 are oceanic, travelling large distances across water. "These are some of the big, important, open ocean predators that people will be familiar with," said Dr Sherley. "The kind of sharks that people might describe as awe-inspiring or charismatic." He said political will is needed to reverse the trends. "The science is there, there needs to be the desire to do those stock assessments, to implement the measures that are needed to reduce the take of sharks and that political will has to come from pressure from citizens," Dr Sherley explained. Despite this "gloomy" picture, the scientists said a few shark conservation stories give cause for hope. Sonja Fordham, president of Shark Advocates International, a non-profit project of The Ocean Foundation, said a couple of species, including the great white, have started to recover through science-based fishing limits. "Relatively simple safeguards can help to save sharks and rays, but time is running out," she said. "We urgently need conservation action across the globe to prevent myriad negative consequences and secure a brighter future for these extraordinary, irreplaceable animals." image captionPopulations can recover with appropriate conservation Sharks are at the top of the food chain, and crucial to the health of the oceans. Their loss impacts other marine animals as well as human livelihoods. "Oceanic sharks and rays are vital to the health of vast marine ecosystems, but because they are hidden beneath the ocean surface, it has been difficult to assess and monitor their status," said Nathan Pacoureau of Simon Fraser University. "Our study represents the first global synthesis of the state of these essential species at a time when countries should be addressing insufficient progress towards global sustainability goals. "While we initially intended it as a useful report card, we now must hope it also serves as an urgent wake-up call."

**Strong IP protection spurs innovation by encouraging risk-taking and incentivizing knowledge sharing—prefer statistical analysis of multiple studies**

**Ezell and Cory 19**

[Stephen Ezell, vice president & global innovation policy @ ITIF, BS Georgetown School of Foreign Service. Nigel Cory, associate director covering trade policy @ ITIF, MA public policy @ Georgetown. "The Way Forward for Intellectual Property Internationally," Information Technology & Innovation Foundation, 4-25-2019, accessed 8-25-2021, https://itif.org/publications/2019/04/25/way-forward-intellectual-property-internationally] HWIC

IPRs Strengthen Innovation Intellectual property rights power innovation. For instance, analyzing the level of intellectual property protections (via the World Economic Forum’s Global Competitiveness reports) and creative outputs (via the Global Innovation Index) shows that counties with stronger IP protection have more creative outputs (in terms of intangible assets and creative goods and services in a nation’s media, printing and publishing, and entertainment industries, including online), even at varying levels of development.46 IPR reforms also introduce strong incentives for domestic innovation. Sherwood, using case studies from 18 developing countries, concluded that poor provision of intellectual property rights deters local innovation and risk-taking.47 In contrast, IPR reform has been associated with increased innovative activity, as measured by domestic patent filings, albeit with some variation across countries and sectors.48 For example, Ryan, in a study of biomedical innovations and patent reform in Brazil, found that patents provided incentives for innovation investments and facilitated the functioning of technology markets.49 Park and Lippoldt also observed that the provision of adequate protection for IPRs can help to stimulate local innovation, in some cases building on the transfer of technologies that provide inputs and spillovers.50 In other words, local innovators are introduced to technologies first through the technology transfer that takes place in an environment wherein protection of IPRs is assured; then, they may build on those ideas to create an evolved product or develop alternate approaches (i.e., to innovate). Related research finds that trade in technology—through channels including imports, foreign direct investment, and technology licensing—improves the quality of developing-country innovation by increasing the pool of ideas and efficiency of innovation by encouraging the division of innovative labor and specialization.51 However, Maskus notes that without protection from potential abuse of their newly developed technologies, foreign enterprises may be less willing to reveal technical information associated with their innovations.52 The protection of patents and trade secrets provides necessary legal assurances for firms wishing to reveal proprietary characteristics of technologies to subsidiaries and licensees via contracts. Counties with stronger IP protection have more creative outputs (in terms of intangible assets and creative goods and services in a nation’s media, printing and publishing, and entertainment industries, including online), even at varying levels of development. The relationship between IPR rights and innovation can also be seen in studies of how the introduction of stronger IPR laws, with regard to patents, copyrights, and trademarks, affect R&D activity in an economy. Studies by Varsakelis and by Kanwar and Evenson found that R&D to GDP ratios are positively related to the strength of patent rights, and are conditional on other factors.53 Cavazos Cepeda et al. found a positive influence of IPRs on the level of R&D in an economy, with each 1 percent increase in the level of protection of IPRs in an economy (as measured by improvements to a country’s score in the Patent Rights Index) equating to, on average, a 0.7 percent increase in the domestic level of R&D.54 Likewise, a 1 percent increase in copyright protection was associated with a 3.3 percent increase in domestic R&D. Similarly, when trademark protection increased by 1 percent, there was an associated R&D increase of 1.4 percent. As the authors concluded, “Increases in the protection of the IPRs carried economic benefits in the form of higher inflows of FDI, and increases in the levels of both domestically conducted R&D and service imports as measured by licensing fees.”55 As Jackson summarized, regarding the relationship between IPR reform and both innovation and R&D, and FDI, “In addition to spurring domestic innovation, strong intellectual property rights can increase incentives for foreign direct investment which in turn also leads to economic growth.”56

#### Increased production of a COVID vaccine makes the scalloped and great hammerhead go extinct and there is no going back – vaccine production will be halted, necessitating a pivot away from squalene requiring further innovation

Butler 9/28/20

Gavin Butler, 1-20-2020, "Half a Million Sharks Could Be Killed to Make a Global COVID Vaccine," Vice, [https://www.vice.com/en/article/k7qdym/half-a-million-sharks-could-be-killed-to-make-a-global-covid-vaccine //](https://www.vice.com/en/article/k7qdym/half-a-million-sharks-could-be-killed-to-make-a-global-covid-vaccine%20//) AW

Conservationists are worried that the mass production of a COVID-19 vaccine could devastate shark populations around the world, as a number of pharmaceutical companies are found to be using oil from the animals’ livers in the development of their vaccines. Squalene, a natural organic compound sourced primarily from shark liver oil, is most commonly used by pharmaceutical companies to produce cosmetics and sunscreens. But the substance also plays a valuable part in vaccine development for the way in which it acts as an “adjuvant”—that is, a pharmacological agent that increases the strength of certain medicines by boosting the immune response in recipients. In short, shark liver oil helps make vaccines stronger. And that, of course, is bad news for sharks—particularly at a time when every major country in the world is scrambling to develop and produce a coronavirus vaccine on a global scale. Data published by the [Regulatory Affairs Professionals Society](https://www.raps.org/news-and-articles/news-articles/2020/3/covid-19-vaccine-tracker) (RAPS) and the [World Health Organisation](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/draft-landscape-of-covid-19-candidate-vaccines) (WHO) indicates that of the 176 candidate vaccines in clinical and preclinical evaluation, 17 use adjuvants. And according to research by US non-profit organisation [Shark Allies](https://www.sharkallies.com/), at least five of those adjuvants are shark squalene-based. One of them is MF59: an adjuvant that typically contains 9.75 milligrams of squalene per dose, and which is currently being used by the University of Queensland, in partnership with biotherapy companies CSL and Seqirus, for the development of a coronavirus vaccine candidate. If every person on Earth was given a single dose of that vaccine, an estimated 249,351 sharks would have to be killed. If two doses of the vaccine are needed to immunise the global population—a likely outcome, according to [some medical experts](https://www.webmd.com/lung/news/20200605/covid-19-vaccine-will-probably-require-two-doses)—the prospective death toll climbs to nearly half a million sharks. “This is not speculation,” Stefanie Brendl, founder and Executive Director of Shark Allies, told VICE News over email. “However, it's not like 500,000 sharks are going to be hunted down in some particular region just so they can be killed for vaccines. No one is going out to specifically kill sharks right now just to get enough for a vaccine. [But] that is not the point.” According to Brendl, the point is that the development and production of coronavirus vaccines is likely to keep multiplying over the coming years as the global population attempts to inoculate itself against a range of coronaviruses. And if the harvesting of shark livers continues to be the primary source of a major ingredient in those vaccines, then worldwide immunisation could carry an immense ecological cost. “It's something we need to get ahead of ASAP, because we are facing many years of vaccine production, for a global population, for many more coronavirus vaccines to come,” said Brendl. “The real danger is in what this can turn into in the future. A reliance on shark oil for a global vaccine—it’s truly insane. A wild animal is not a reliable source and cannot sustain ongoing commercial pressure. [And] the overfishing of sharks globally is already at critical levels.” Brendl points out that the squalene industry is already taking 2.7 million sharks for cosmetics use—a number that is predicted to double by 2024 and triple by 2027—while millions more are taken for fin harvesting and as a result of overfishing in general. Often the squalene is harvested as a by-product of these activities, but “livering”—where a shark is killed only for its liver, or has its liver taken before being thrown back into the water—is also an issue in some parts of the world. Great whites, hammerheads and endangered whale sharks are among those most often targeted for their livers. And conservationists like Brendl are worried that a squalene-dependent COVID vaccine could spell further disaster for shark species that are already at critical levels. That doesn’t mean they want researchers to delay the development of vaccines until they can ensure the absolute preservation of sharks, though. “That is not what we are asking for,” Brendl said. “We are asking for producers to continue what they are doing. There is no need to halt or slow down anything. We ask that they start testing non-animal based squalene ALONGSIDE animal based squalene for all uses … We ask that the pharmaceutical and the cosmetics industry replace their shark squalene with alternatives as soon as possible without affecting current vaccine development.” In recent years scientists have started turning to more sustainable, plant-based sources for squalene, including vegetable oils from rice bran, wheat germ and olives. In 2015 a team of researchers in the US [produced squalene biosynthetically](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4527182/) using genetically engineered bacteria. In 2013, a team of researchers in Poland [noted that the oil from amaranth seeds](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23449131/) could be used as a promising source of squalene, stressing that “in the interest of protecting biodiversity, raw materials of animal origin must be replaced by alternative sources that respect our environment”. “The industries stand to profit immensely from having a global vaccine,” said Brendl. “It is reasonable to ask that they start thinking about a reliable and sustainable production.”

#### The extinction of the great/scalloped hammerhead means disaster for the marine ecosystem – low bar for solvency because of already critical endangerment

Newcastle 19

University of Newcastle ( this article is just an explanation of a study, so author quals besides Vincent Raoult PhD don’t matter), 11-21-2019, "Great Hammerhead Shark is top of the food chain – new study," University of Newcastle, Australia, [https://www.newcastle.edu.au/newsroom/featured/great-hammerhead-shark-is-top-of-the-food-chain-new-study //](https://www.newcastle.edu.au/newsroom/featured/great-hammerhead-shark-is-top-of-the-food-chain-new-study%20//) AW

Great Hammerhead Shark is top of the food chain – new study Friday, 15 November 2019 Share Crucial information about the Great Hammerhead Shark that underlines their importance for the Australian coastal ecosystem has been uncovered by marine ecologists at the University of Newcastle. Dr Vincent Raoult has found that Great Hammerhead Sharks are apex predators (top of the food chain) in the coastal ecosystem because they specialise in eating other sharks and rays. A new study, [Resource use of great hammerhead sharks (Sphyrna mokarran) off eastern Australia](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jfb.14160), which is the first of its kind to determine the role of large adult great hammerhead sharks in coastal food chains, has found that they are apex predators (top of the food chain) in the coastal ecosystem because they specialise in eating other sharks and rays. With populations of the shark having declined by more than 90 per cent over the last 50 years on the east coast, lead researcher [Dr Vincent Raoult](https://www.newcastle.edu.au/profile/vincent-raoult) said he hoped the research would result in added protection for the species. “Until now the role of these sharks in the food webs of coastal ecosystems has been poorly understood,” said Dr Raoult. “What our research has found is that the great hammerhead shark is in fact the ‘shark predator’, it confirms that they are at the top of the food chain and highlights that their role in our coastal ecosystem is absolutely crucial.” “**Apex predators keep the balance of our ecosystem in check, they keep it healthy,** so this discovery about the great hammerhead really emphasises its importance.” Video: Great Hammerhead Shark found to top the marine food chain By studying stable isotopes of samples of muscle, liver and vertebrae - the black box for sharks - from large great hammerhead sharks caught as a bycatch off eastern Australia, researchers were able to determine that S. mokarran greater than three metres feed primarily on whaler sharks and stingrays – shifting the larger sharks into apex predator roles across multiple food webs off eastern Australia. The great hammerhead shark is the largest member of the Sphyrnidae and can reach lengths greater than 4.5 metres. They are highly ecologically specialised as a species, meaning they rely on their unique head (cephalofoil) and very large dorsal fin to feed on very specific prey, which puts them at higher risk of extinction. The species are listed as Vulnerable in NSW and the decline in the population reflects demand for their fins, commercial fishing activities and that they are often bycaught in bather-protection programs involving gillnets and drumlines off eastern Australia. “We know that the great hammerhead is vulnerable to commercial and recreational fishing, and that they die very easily when released after capture,” said Dr Raoult. “Now that our study has shown just how important their role is in linking coastal food webs, it is absolutely crucial that we see urgent conservation of the species. As apex predators their extinction would have a vast ecological impact on the coastal ecosystem and protection is essential to support stability across economically important coastal ecosystems.” The research was carried out in conjunction with Macquarie University and funded by a Sea World Research and Rescue Foundation Grant and the NSW Department of Primary Industry. The paper was published in the [Journal of Fish Biology.](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jfb.14160)

#### Marine ecosystems are critical to the survival of all life on earth.

Robin Kundis **Craig**, Associate Professor of Law, Indiana University School of Law, **2k3** 34 McGeorge L. Rev. 155

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. n856 Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. n857 More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." n858 In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet's ability to support life. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems**.** Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." n859 Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. [\*265] Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. n860 Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. n861 Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." n862 At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world. We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves, and we will take most of the biosphere with us. The Black Sea is almost dead, n863 its once-complex and productive ecosystem almost entirely replaced by a monoculture of comb jellies, "starving out fish and dolphins, emptying fishermen's nets, and converting the web of life into brainless, wraith-like blobs of jelly." n864 More importantly, the Black Sea is not necessarily unique. The Black Sea is a microcosm of what is happening to the ocean systems at large. The stresses piled up: overfishing, oil spills, industrial discharges, nutrient pollution, wetlands destruction, the introduction of an alien species. The sea weakened, slowly at first, then collapsed with [\*266] shocking suddenness. The lessons of this tragedy should not be lost to the rest of us, because much of what happened here is being repeated all over the world. The ecological stresses imposed on the Black Sea were not unique to communism. Nor, sadly, was the failure of governments to respond to the emerging crisis. n865 Oxygen-starved "dead zones" appear with increasing frequency off the coasts of major cities and major rivers, forcing marine animals to flee and killing all that cannot. n866 Ethics as well as enlightened self-interest thus suggest that the United States should protect fully-functioning marine ecosystems wherever possible - even if a few fishers go out of business as a result.

# \*\*WTO21- Safety DA\*\*

## \*\*1NC\*\*

#### Covid-19 vaccines are safe and effective right now.

Moline ‘21

(Heidi L. Moline, MD; Michael Whitaker, MPH; Li Deng, PhD; Julia C. Rhodes, PhD; Jennifer Milucky, MSPH; Huong Pham, MPH; Kadam Patel, MPH; Onika Anglin, MPH; Arthur Reingold, MD Shua J. Chai, MD; Nisha B. Alden, MPH; Breanna Kawasaki, “Effectiveness of COVID-19 Vaccines in Preventing Hospitalization Among Adults Aged ≥65 Years” <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7032e3.htm> , August 13)

Clinical trials of COVID-19 vaccines currently authorized for emergency use in the United States (Pfizer-BioNTech, Moderna, and Janssen [Johnson & Johnson]) indicate that these vaccines have high efficacy against symptomatic disease, including moderate to severe illness (1–3). In addition to clinical trials, real-world assessments of COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness are critical in guiding vaccine policy and building vaccine confidence, particularly among populations at higher risk for more severe illness from COVID-19, including older adults. To determine the real-world effectiveness of the three currently authorized COVID-19 vaccines among persons aged ≥65 years during February 1–April 30, 2021, data on 7,280 patients from the COVID-19–Associated Hospitalization Surveillance Network (COVID-NET) were analyzed with vaccination coverage data from state immunization information systems (IISs) for the COVID-NET catchment area (approximately 4.8 million persons). Among adults aged 65–74 years, effectiveness of full vaccination in preventing COVID-19–associated hospitalization was 96% (95% confidence interval [CI] = 94%–98%) for Pfizer-BioNTech, 96% (95% CI = 95%–98%) for Moderna, and 84% (95% CI = 64%–93%) for Janssen vaccine products. Effectiveness of full vaccination in preventing COVID-19–associated hospitalization among adults aged ≥75 years was 91% (95% CI = 87%–94%) for Pfizer-BioNTech, 96% (95% CI = 93%–98%) for Moderna, and 85% (95% CI = 72%–92%) for Janssen vaccine products. COVID-19 vaccines currently authorized in the United States are highly effective in preventing COVID-19–associated hospitalizations in older adults. In light of real-world data demonstrating high effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines among older adults, efforts to increase vaccination coverage in this age group are critical to reducing the risk for COVID-19–related hospitalization. COVID-NET includes data on laboratory-confirmed COVID-19–associated hospitalizations in 99 U.S. counties in 14 states, representing approximately 10% of the U.S. population.† COVID-NET cases were hospitalizations that occurred in residents of a designated COVID-NET catchment area who were admitted within 14 days of a positive SARS-CoV-2 test result. COVID-NET program personnel collected information on COVID-19 vaccination status (vaccine product received, number of doses, and administration dates) from state IISs for all sampled COVID-NET cases.§ Some sites expanded collection of information on vaccination status to all reported COVID-NET cases, not only sampled cases, which were included for analysis if all cases in a single month had vaccination status available. Data from 13 sites were included for analysis; one site (Iowa) does not have access to the state IIS and cannot collect vaccination data.¶ Population-level vaccination coverage was determined using deidentified person-level COVID-19 vaccination data reported to CDC by jurisdictions, pharmacies, and federal entities through the IISs,\*\* Vaccine Administration Management System,†† or direct data submission.§§ The study was restricted to adults aged ≥65 years and included the period February 1–April 30, 2021. The Janssen vaccine was authorized for use during the study period beginning March 15, 2021.¶¶ Patients were classified as 1) unvaccinated (no IIS record of vaccination), 2) partially vaccinated (1 dose of Moderna or Pfizer-BioNTech received ≥14 days before hospitalization or 2 doses, with the second dose received <14 days before hospitalization), or 3) fully vaccinated (receipt of both doses of Moderna or Pfizer-BioNTech with second dose received ≥14 days before hospitalization or receipt of a single dose of Janssen ≥14 days before hospitalization). Patients with only 1 dose of any COVID-19 vaccine received <14 days before hospitalization were excluded. Daily county-level coverage data for adults aged 65–74 and ≥75 years in the COVID-NET catchment area were estimated using population denominators from the U.S. Census Bureau; vaccination status was classified as described for hospitalized cases.\*\*\* For vaccine records missing county of residence, county of vaccine administration was used. To estimate vaccine effectiveness and corresponding 95% CIs, methods were adapted based on previously published literature (4). Poisson regression was used to compare case counts by vaccination status (outcome) and the proportion of the population vaccinated and unvaccinated (offset).††† Data were stratified by age group because of the potential for confounding by age, and adjusted for COVID-NET site, time (number of weeks since the start of the study period as a categorical covariate), and monthly site-specific sampling frequency.§§§ Vaccine effectiveness was calculated as one minus the exponent of the estimated coefficient of the exposure (vaccination status) variable. For estimating effectiveness of full vaccination, partially vaccinated persons were excluded; for estimating effectiveness of partial vaccination, fully vaccinated persons were excluded. Vaccine product–specific estimates excluded persons who had received other COVID-19 vaccines. To account for the interval between infection and hospitalization, sensitivity analyses were conducted using a reference date 1 week and 2 weeks before admission, rather than admission date, for classification of vaccination status for cases (i.e., adding 7 and 14 days, respectively between last vaccine dose and hospital admission date); the same adjustment was included for population vaccination coverage. Statistical analyses were conducted using SAS software (version 9.4; SAS Institute). This activity was reviewed by CDC and was conducted consistent with applicable federal law and CDC policy.¶¶¶ During February 1–April 30, 2021, among 7,280 eligible COVID-NET patients, 5,451 (75%) were unvaccinated, 867 (12%) were partially vaccinated, and 394 (5%) were fully vaccinated; 568 (8%) who received a single vaccine dose <14 days before hospitalization were excluded from the analysis (Table). Vaccination coverage in the population increased rapidly during this period among persons aged ≥65 years and varied by age and vaccine product (Figure 1). Among adults aged ≥65 years in the COVID-NET catchment area, full vaccination coverage from any of the three authorized vaccines ranged from 0.7% on February 1, 2021, to 72% on April 30, 2021. Effectiveness of full vaccination in preventing hospitalization among adults aged 65–74 years was estimated at 96% (95% CI = 94%–98%) for Pfizer-BioNTech, 96% (95% CI = 95%–98%) for Moderna, and 84% (95% CI = 64%–93%) for Janssen vaccine products. Among adults aged ≥75 years, effectiveness of full vaccination was 91% (95% CI = 87%–94%) for Pfizer-BioNTech, 96% (95% CI = 93%–98%) for Moderna, and 85% (95% CI = 72%–92%) for Janssen vaccine products (Figure 2). Effectiveness of partial vaccination among adults aged 65–74 years was 84% (95% CI = 76%–89%) for Pfizer-BioNTech and 91% (95% CI = 87%–93%) for Moderna vaccine products. Among those aged ≥75 years, effectiveness of partial vaccination was 66% (95% CI = 48%–77%) for Pfizer-BioNTech and 82% (95% CI = 76%–86%) for Moderna vaccine products. Sensitivity analyses accounting for interval between infection and hospitalization did not yield notably different vaccine effectiveness estimates, with point estimates varying by <1% for Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccine models. Point estimates for Janssen COVID-19 vaccine models varied by <10%, with few cases eligible for inclusion and wide CIs.

#### But, waiving patent rights does not guarantee vaccine safety

Smith Spark ‘21

(Laura,- Former Senior Broadcast Journalist for the BBC, and Newsweek editor of CNN,,“Right Countries Urged to Share Vaccine Knowledge as WTO Debates Waving Patents” <https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/05/world/covid-19-vaccine-patents-wto-intl/index.html>, May 05)

If the proposed waiver were to be approved, then **technological know-how** must be transferred to new production sites as well as the intellectual property rights, Rockwell said. Countries must also ensure that they have a strict but transparent regulatory infrastructure in place, he added. The proposed waiver has previously been obstructed by a ["small number" of wealthier nations](https://www.msf.org/countries-obstructing-covid-19-patent-waiver-must-allow-negotiations), according to Doctors Without Borders. When it was blocked at the WTO in March, aid organization [Oxfam](https://reliefweb.int/report/world/oxfam-response-wto-trips-waiver-covid-19-vaccines-being-blocked-again-rich-countries) slammed the decision as a "massive missed opportunity" to speed up worldwide vaccine production, and accused rich countries of "siding with a handful of pharmaceutical corporations in protecting their monopolies against the needs of the majority of developing countries who are struggling to administer a single dose."**Gross Failure of Leadership** Rights group Amnesty International and the People's Vaccine Alliance urged G7 leaders Wednesday to listen to their people and ensure vaccine knowledge is shared. "G7 governments have clear human rights obligations to put the lives of millions of people across the world ahead of the interests of the pharmaceutical companies that they have funded," said Steve Cockburn, head of economic and social justice at Amnesty International, [in a news release](https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2021/05/an-average-of-7-in-10-across-g7-countries-think-their-governments-should-force-big-pharma-to-share-vaccine-know-how/). "It would be a gross failure of leadership to continue blocking the sharing of life-saving technologies, and would only serve to prolong the immense pain and suffering caused by this pandemic." Wednesday's WTO meeting comes a day after the chief of Pfizer said the company was expecting approximately $26 billion in revenue from its Covid-19 vaccine in 2021.More than 300 public health experts [signed a letter](https://www.publichealth.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/trips_sign_on_letter_4-30-21.pdf) Friday arguing that the United States should join an effort to force vaccine makers to waive intellectual property rights to coronavirus vaccines and treatments so more countries can start making them. The group, led by Columbia University professors Terry McGovern and Chelsea Clinton, said the so-called TRIPS waiver would allow local manufacture of vaccines, treatments and diagnostics. "Allowing countries to manufacture locally will speed access to vaccines and treatment, prevent unnecessary deaths, and facilitate a stronger, faster economic recovery," they wrote. "Until vaccines, testing, and treatments are accessible to everyone everywhere we risk recurring new variants, drug resistance, and greater loss of life and suffering at home and globally." That appeal came a fortnight after more than 170 former world leaders and Nobel laureates, including former UK Prime Minister Gordon Brown, former President of Liberia Ellen Johnson Sirleaf and former French President François Hollande sent an [open letter to the White House](https://peoplesvaccinealliance.medium.com/open-letter-former-heads-of-state-and-nobel-laureates-call-on-president-biden-to-waive-e0589edd5704) urging President Joe Biden to support the temporary waiver on IP rights for Covid-19 vaccines at the WTO. **Legal Battles** But even as public pressure grows, some experts argue that handing over the IP rights for Covid-19 vaccines won't necessarily mean that more can be rapidly produced worldwide at large scale. US infectious diseases chief Anthony Fauci [told the UK's Financial Times](https://www.ft.com/content/2f41b122-5738-4707-a822-0d79276710c5) on Monday that he was not convinced that forcing companies to share their intellectual property was the most effective approach, warning that legal battles could slow the process."Going back and forth, consuming time and lawyers in a legal argument about waivers -- that is not the endgame. People are dying around the world and we have to get vaccines into their arms in the fastest and most efficient way possible," he said. Thomas Bollyky, director of the Global Health Program at the Council on Foreign Relations, told CNN on Friday that what's really needed to scale up global manufacturing of vaccines is technology transfer. "It's not just a matter of intellectual property. It's also the **transfer of know-how,**" he said. "I **don't think there's clear evidence** that a waiver of an intellectual property is going to be the best way for that technology transfer to occur."Waiving patents will not work in the same way for vaccines as it has for drugs, Bollyky said. For HIV drugs, for example, manufacturers were more or less able to reverse engineer them without much help from the original developer. It's **very different for vaccines**, where it's really a **biological process** as much as a product. It's hard to scale up manufacturing in this process for the original company, let alone another manufacturer trying to figure this out without assistance," he said. "**It requires a lot of knowledge that's not part of the IP."** The deal between AstraZeneca and the Serum Institute of India is a successful example of such technology transfer, Bollyky said, where the licensing of IP happened voluntarily. "The question is what can we do to facilitate more deals like the one between AstraZeneca and the Serum Institute of India to have this transfer," he said.

#### The plan leads to uncontrolled use of patented technologies, which turns vaccine access, and causes dangerous health consequences.

Crosby and Diamond ‘21

(Daniel Crosby JD@Washington University of Law, Evan Diamond JD@Harvard Law School M.S. Biochemistry@UPenn, Isabel Fernandez de la Cuesta JD@Complutense University Madrid, Jamieson Greer JD@University of Virginia Law School, Jeffery Telep JD@University of Florida, Brian White JD@University of Virginia, “Group of Nearly 60 WTO Members Seek Unprecedented Waiver from WTO Intellectual Property Protection for Covid-related Medical Projects” <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/group-of-nearly-60-wto-members-seek-2523821/>, March 05)

Waiver risks uncontrolled use of patented technologies, without improving vaccine access.Pharmaceutical companies can provide, and have provided, licenses to distribute or scale-up production of COVID-19 vaccines and therapies at reduced cost. Such license agreements allow for expanded access in low- and middle-income countries, while also setting reasonable parameters so that patents and other IP rights are used to address the specific medical needs of the COVID-19 pandemic at hand, and not for other purposes. License agreements also allow for orderly technology transfer, including of unpatented “trade secret” information and other critical “know-how,” that may be essential to efficiently producing and scaling-up safe and effective versions of technologically complex vaccines and biologic drug products. Under the present TRIPS waiver proposal, however, member countries could try to exploit an extraordinarily broad scope of IP and copy patented technologies so long as they are “in relation to prevention, containment or treatment of COVID-19.” For example, under an expansive reading of the proposed waiver language, a member country could try to produce patented pharmaceutical compounds that have other indicated uses predating COVID-19, if such compounds had later been studied or experimentally used for potential symptomatic relief or antiviral activity in COVID-19 patients. The same risks may be faced by manufacturers of patented materials or devices that have multiple uses predating COVID-19, but also may be used as “personal protective equipment” or components thereof, or in other measures arguably relating to COVID-19 “prevention” or “containment.”At the same time, it is unclear how the proposed TRIPS waiver could provide the technology transfer and know-how critical for making the complex molecules and formulations constituting the various COVID-19 vaccines. Vaccine manufacture undertaken by an unauthorized party without the proper processes and controls could result in a different product that is potentially ineffective or results in unwanted health consequences. And even if an unauthorized manufacturer could overcome those substantial hurdles to reverse-engineer and scale up a safe and effective vaccine copy, it would likely take substantial time and a series of failures to do so. Notably, several of the original COVID-19 vaccine developers have recently faced low product yield and other manufacturing challenges during pre-commercial scale-up efforts and the initial months of commercial production.

# Case

#### Reducing IP rights aren’t quick enough to help the pandemic – legal battles slow the process – experts agree

Smith 05/05

(Laura Smith-Spark; Newsdesk Editor, CNN Digital; (05-05-21) Rich nations urged to share vaccine knowledge while WTO debates waiving patents; CNN; <https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/05/world/covid-19-vaccine-patents-wto-intl/index.html>; CKD)

But even as public pressure grows, some experts argue that handing over the IP rights for Covid-19 vaccines won't necessarily mean that more can be rapidly produced worldwide at large scale. US infectious diseases chief Anthony Fauci [told the UK's Financial Times](https://www.ft.com/content/2f41b122-5738-4707-a822-0d79276710c5) on Monday that he was not convinced that forcing companies to share their intellectual property was the most effective approach, warning that legal battles could slow the process. "Going back and forth, consuming time and lawyers in a legal argument about waivers -- that is not the endgame. People are dying around the world and we have to get vaccines into their arms in the fastest and most efficient way possible," he said.

#### Tech transfer is key and not included under IP

Smith 05/05

(Laura Smith-Spark; Newsdesk Editor, CNN Digital; (05-05-21) Rich nations urged to share vaccine knowledge while WTO debates waiving patents; CNN; <https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/05/world/covid-19-vaccine-patents-wto-intl/index.html>; CKD)

Thomas Bollyky, director of the Global Health Program at the Council on Foreign Relations, told CNN on Friday that what's really needed to scale up global manufacturing of vaccines is technology transfer. "It's not just a matter of intellectual property. It's also the transfer of know-how," he said. "I don't think there's clear evidence that a waiver of an intellectual property is going to be the best way for that technology transfer to occur." Waiving patents will not work in the same way for vaccines as it has for drugs, Bollyky said. For HIV drugs, for example, manufacturers were more or less able to reverse engineer them without much help from the original developer. "It's very different for vaccines, where it's really a biological process as much as a product. It's hard to scale up manufacturing in this process for the original company, let alone another manufacturer trying to figure this out without assistance," he said. "It requires a lot of knowledge that's not part of the IP." The deal between AstraZeneca and the Serum Institute of India is a successful example of such technology transfer, Bollyky said, where the licensing of IP happened voluntarily. "The question is what can we do to facilitate more deals like the one between AstraZeneca and the Serum Institute of India to have this transfer," he said. Michael Head, senior research fellow in global health at the University of Southampton, in England, told CNN that increasing regional manufacturing capacity, particularly in the global south, was key -- and should be a focus between pandemics. "Sharing intellectual property during the pandemic is something that should happen but that doesn't resolve the issues," he said. "Manufacturing vaccines is hard. It's hard to rapidly set up a new site with all the equipment, infrastructure, all the vaccine ingredients, with suitable staff to produce a large number of high quality vaccine products." Philanthropist Bill Gates, a major supporter of [global Covid-19 vaccine equity](https://www.cnn.com/2021/02/05/world/covax-explainer-intl/index.html) through the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, also [told Sky News](https://news.sky.com/story/covid-19-bill-gates-hopeful-world-completely-back-to-normal-by-end-of-2022-and-vaccine-sharing-to-ramp-up-12285840) last month that he did not believe overriding IP rules was the answer. "There's only so many vaccine factories in the world and people are very serious about the safety of vaccines," he said. "The thing that's holding things back in this case is not intellectual property. There's not, like, some idle vaccine factory with regulatory approval that makes magically safe vaccines. You've got to do the trials on these things and every manufacturing process has to be looked at in a very careful way."

#### Aff doesn’t attack all of the root causes of disease spread

Brant & Burns 7-29-21 [Jennifer Brant, CEO and Founder of Innovation Insights, and Thaddeus Burns, Head of Life Science Government & Public Affairs at Merck and served in senior positions at the US Department of Commerce and the White House Office of the US Trade Representative, served as a member of the National Academy of Sciences Committee charged with preparing a report on the science and technology capabilities of the U.S. Department of State. “Trade restrictions are delaying the COVID response. The WTO must act.” July 29, 2021. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/07/wto-members-must-launch-new-work-to-reinforce-the-covid-response-in-november/>] AL

The COVID-19 pandemic hit at a time when bio-manufacturing was undergoing a process of democratization. Technological progress had enabled growing capacity in many countries including Brazil, Indonesia, South Africa, Tunisia, Argentina, and Egypt. By 2020, the business model for bio-manufacturing had fundamentally changed and it was becoming the norm for companies to distribute research, development and manufacturing across geographies and work with partners. As recently as 15 years ago, building a facility to produce biologics such as monoclonal antibodies or vaccines could require an investment of as much as €500m, and it would take up to 3 years to bring that facility online. New manufacturing technologies have made it cheaper and easier to build new facilities and to scale up existing ones. Today, an investment of €20m can get a bio-manufacturing plant up and running. Such changes are part of the reason the global community was able to launch production of new COVID-19 vaccines so quickly. The urgency of COVID-19 accelerated further innovations in bio-manufacturing equipment and processes, and compressed production time in a way that will have positive impacts in the future. But the pandemic also revealed major weaknesses in global value chains. It was difficult for manufacturers to keep up with the sudden surge for demand for raw materials and equipment, as many new research and development and manufacturing partnerships rapidly took off. To extend capacity, new employees, intensive training and collaboration, and more infrastructure were needed. The global community was faced with the reality that facilities cannot be built everywhere in an instant, and that there are bottlenecks in the supply chain. Government action in some cases made things worse. Some countries enacted export restrictions on COVID-related products, which made it extremely difficult to run a global supply chain. Another difficult issue has been the tariffs applied on biologics and the products needed for their manufacture. Eighteen months into the pandemic, biologics manufacturers are still trying to cope with a range of challenges. There is still surging demand for equipment and raw materials. In some cases, they have expanded manufacturing capacity to produce more equipment such as filters and bioreactors. This continues to require time and significant investments.

#### WTO undermines global democracy.

**Staples**, Chair of the International Network on Disarmament and Globalization, **1999,** Steven, Chair, The WTO and the Global War System, Northwestern Disarmament Coalition Proceedings, November 28, <http://www.ratical.org/co-globalize/WTOandGWSfp.html>

The evolving power imbalance between governments and corporations, not just in the weapons industry but in all industries, is becoming well understood by many progressive economists and social activists. International free trade agreements such as those in the World Trade Organization (WTO) play a key role in what has become popularly known as "corporate rule," **which works to usurp democracy.** Maude Barlow, National Chair of the Council of Canadians, says corporations have spent the last fifty years fighting communism. Now they are fighting democracy itself. The World Trade Organization has become the architect of the new global economy and corporate rule. It is striking down government laws and programs around the world that conflict with corporate interests but are vital for peace. Environmental protection, cultural and social programs, health and safety standards, and other programs which create just and peaceful societies are all under attack.

#### The US has structurally undermined WTO legitimacy – every WTO ruling gets vetoed

Baschuk 2/22 [(Bryce, reporter for Bloomberg Economics based in Geneva, Switzerland, has been published in Bloomberg, the Washington Times, United Press International and National Public Radio) “Biden Picks Up Where Trump Left Off in Hard-Line Stances at WTO,” Bloomberg, 2/22/2021] TDI

President Joe Biden’s administration dashed hopes for a softer approach to the World Trade Organization by pursuing a pair of his predecessor’s strategies that critics say risk undermining the international trading system.

The U.S. delegation to the WTO, in a statement Monday obtained by Bloomberg, backed the Trump administration’s decision to label Hong Kong exports as “Made in China” and said the WTO had no right to mediate the matter because the organization’s rules permit countries to take any action to protect their “essential security interests.”

“The situation with respect to Hong Kong, China, constitutes a threat to the national security of the United States,” the U.S. delegation said. “Issues of national security are not matters appropriate for adjudication in the WTO dispute-settlement system.”

Prior to 2016, WTO members generally steered clear of defending their trade actions on the basis of national security because doing so could encourage other nations to pursue protectionist policies that have little or nothing to do with hostile threats.

That changed in 2018, when the Trump administration triggered a cold war-era law to justify tariffs on foreign imports of steel and aluminum. In response, a handful of U.S. trade partners, including Canada, the EU, and China filed disputes at the WTO and a ruling in those cases is expected later this year.

Since then, more nations -- including Saudi Arabia, India, Russia and others -- have cited the WTO’s national-security exemption in regional trade fights, leading trade experts to warn that such cases could erode the organization’s ability to mediate disputes.

The Biden administration on Monday said the U.S. has consistently argued that national-security disputes are not subject to WTO review because it would infringe on a member’s right to determine what is in its own security interests.

In spite of the U.S. objection, the WTO granted Hong Kong’s dispute inquiry and will establish a panel of experts to deliberate the matter and render a decision, which could take two to three years.

At the same meeting, the Biden administration said it would not agree to appoint new members to the WTO’s appellate body,

#### Strong IP protections encourage private sector cooperation, investments and research

Donohue no date

(Thomas J. Donohue; served as president and chief executive officer of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce from 1997 to 2019,  established the U.S. Chamber Institute for Legal Reform, served for 13 years as president and CEO of the American Trucking Association, bachelor’s degree from St. John’s University and a master’s degree in business administration from Adelphi University; (accessed 08-24-21) Why Intellectual Property Protection Matters in the Time of Coronavirus; <https://www.theglobalipcenter.com/why-intellectual-property-protection-matters-in-the-time-of-coronavirus/>; CKD)

The coronavirus is placing a huge strain on hospitals, doctors, and nurses. While some states are beginning to see a plateau or decline in cases, others have yet to be hit with the full force of this terrible pandemic.  Meanwhile, its economic impact is proving to be relentless and wide ranging. But the American people are proving resilient and are finding ways to adapt. Only through an “all-of-society” approach will we be able to beat this virus and get ourselves back on track. Just a quick scan of the headlines shows how much the business community is doing to help our human family. In the spirit of scientific inquiry, U.S. Chamber member companies continue to work alongside government research labs and universities to find a cure for COVID-19. Front and center in this fight is a silent partner—strong intellectual property protections—a cornerstone of the American tradition. The average person might not know it, but today 57% of all new medicines come from the United States and private biopharmaceutical companies make up more than 80% of the investment in the research and development of those new drugs. Supported by strong patenting norms, companies like Johnson & Johnson, Gilead, Novartis, and Bayer—to name a few—have announced promising developments i

# Condo Good

## Condo Good – Short

#### The neg gets conditional advocacies.

### Offense

#### 1. Logic- proving a CP is bad doesn’t prove the plan is good, a logical policy maker can always choose not to act. Logic outweighs – it’s the basis of all rational arguments.

#### 2. Neg Flex- we are inherently reactionary, we need in round flexibility to test the plan and have a fighting chance. If they had phenomenal answers to the CP the debate would be over after the 1AR which is educationally bankrupt.