### 1NC Topicality Medicine

#### A. Interpretation-The affirmative must limit IP for medicines, not medical technology

#### 1. Medicines are consumable substances that treat or prevent disease

Kurrer 21 [Christian Kurrer, Policy Analyst at European Parliament. "Medicines and Medical Devices," European Parliament, 05-2021, accessed 9-2-2021, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/50/medicines-and-medical-devices] HWIC

A. General rules on medicines

A medicinal product (medicine) is a substance or combination of substances that is used for the treatment or prevention of diseases in human beings. With the aim of safeguarding public health, the market authorisation, classification and labelling of medicines has been regulated in the EU since 1965. The evaluation of medicines has been centralised through the European Medicines Agency (EMA) since its creation in 1993 and a centralised authorisation procedure was put in place in 1995 to guarantee the highest level of public health and to secure the availability of medicinal products. The main pieces of legislation in this area are Directive 2001/83/EC[[1]](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/50/medicines-and-medical-devices" \l "_ftn1) and Regulation (EC) No 726/2004[[2]](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/50/medicines-and-medical-devices" \l "_ftn2), which lay down the rules for establishing centralised and decentralised procedures.

#### 2. CRISPR is a gene editing platform, it can help develop medicine(s) but it is not medicine

Editas No Date

(Editas Medicine is a leading genome editing company focused on translating the power and potential of the CRISPR/Cas9 and CRISPR/Cpf1 (also known as Cas12a) genome editing systems into a robust pipeline of medicines for people living with serious diseases around the world. https://www.editasmedicine.com/crispr-gene-editing/)

CRISPR (pronounced “crisper”) is an acronym for “Clustered, Regularly Interspaced, Short Palindromic Repeats,” and refers to a recently developed gene editing technology that can revise, remove, and replace DNA in a highly targeted manner. CRISPR is a dynamic, versatile tool that allows us to get to and edit nearly any location in the genome, and has the potential to help us develop medicines for people with a wide variety of diseases. We view CRISPR as a “platform” technology because of its ability to target DNA in any cell or tissue. CRISPR uses a combination of 2 types of molecules to edit disease-related genes or to modify cells: a nuclease (the gene editor) and guide RNA (which helps the nuclease find the right place to edit). CRISPR’s ability to only edit intended DNA targets and avoid off-target editing is known as its specificity. Achieving high levels of specificity requires the right combination of nuclease and guide RNA.

#### 3. A narrow definition of medicine is vital to education- broad definitions turn the case

Marcum, PhD, 08

(James A., Philosophy@Baylor, An Introductory Philosophy of Medicine Humanizing Modern Medicine )

Although Caplan's thesis for the non-existence for philosophy of medicine was critiqued mainly in terms of the criteria for establishing a discipline, his thesis was also criticized by a few with respect to his definition for philosophy of medicine. Some philosophers of medicine felt Caplan's definition was too narrow and wanted to broaden it. For example, Engelhardt and Kevin Wildes argued for an expanded conception of the philosophy of medicine. Although one could argue, pro Caplan, that philosophy of medicine engages no unique problems vis-n-vis philosophy of science or biology Engelhardt and Wildes held, contra Caplan, "there would still be merit in exploring the ways in which philosophical study and analysis can be directed to the understanding of medicine" (1995, p. 1683). Kenneth Schaffner and Engelhardt argued for an even broader conception for philosophy of medicine, "as encompassing those issues in epistemology, axiology, logic, methodology and metaphysics generated by or related to medicine" (1998, p. 264). They included not only the natural sciences but also the social sciences, e.g. George Engel's biopsychosocial model. In response to the broad or expansive definition for the philosophy of medicine, Pellegrino insisted that such a definition "dilutes the specificity of philosophy of medicine and weakens the identification of a definite set of problems" (1998, p. 319). He then proposed a more narrow definition for philosophy of medicine as "a critical reflection on the matter of medicine-on the content, method, concepts and presuppositions peculiar to medicine as medicine" (Pellegrino, 1998, p. 325). The goal of this relationship is to understand medicine per se, i.e. the ultimate reality of what constitutes medicine beyond the entities that are studied in medicine. To that end, Pellegrino claimed that the philosophy of medicine requires a precise or narrow definition of medicine.

#### B. Violation- the plan weakens patents on medical research technology, not medicine.

#### C. Reasons to Prefer

#### 1. The negative interpretation is superior- Prefer qualified evidence from experts with intent to define over contextual evidence from journalists that is less precise

#### 2.The affirmative interpretation is unreasonable -expanding beyond a strict definition of medicine opens the floodgates and makes neg prep impossible

FDA Fact Sheet No Date https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/fda-basics/fact-sheet-fda-glance

There are over 20,000 prescription drug products approved for marketing. FDA oversees over 6,500 different medical device product categories. There are over 1,600 FDA-approved animal drug products. There are about 300 FDA-licensed biologics products.

#### 3. Extra topicality and plan vagueness are voting issues- they cause 2NR meltdown as we are forced to go for T or a CP to get back to ground zero

#### D. Topicality is a voting issue for predictable limits- it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for. It should be evaluated through competing interpretations- its not what you do its what you justify

**1NC – Innov**

**Pharma industry innovation is up but profit margins are razor thin**

**Young 9-14-21**

(Peter, CEO and President of Young & Partners, and a member of Pharm Exec’s Editorial Advisory Board. https://www.pharmexec.com/view/fishawack-health-appoints-new-ceo-jonathan-koch)

Business. The business outlook for pharma manufacturers is positive with regard to drug development and the **volume and quality of promising drugs in the pipeline**. The industry’s innovations in drug development and productivity **have improved**. Combined with indirect R&D pursuits through the biotech industry, overall development activity has been **strong and should continue to be strong**. There has been a shift in emphasis toward orphan drugs, oncology therapies, new innovations such as mRNA, gene therapy, CAR-T, immune system solutions, CRISPR, etc. The current pandemic has been a plus for the reputation of the industry, but a negative with regard to the ability to execute clinical trials and to maintain industry supply chains. Generic pharma companies are **under severe profit pressures** and will continue to consolidate, cut costs, and try to push selectively into higher value and more protected product areas. They are under intense pricing and competitive pressure.

#### **CRISPR tech K2 biopharma profits—recent developments in CRISPR have made biotech pharma companies’ stocks soar.**

Yeung 21

Thomas Yeung; BA in Economics from Princeton University, Market Analyst at InvestorPlace, associate of Harding Loevner, a $40 billion asset management; “The 3 Biotech Firms Riding High on CRISPR News”; NASDAQ; June 30, 2021; <https://investorplace.com/author/tyeung/>; EMJ

But biotechs are also some of the best Moonshots out there. Bring a successful drug to market, and your stock will go from $4 to $200; Covid-19 vaccine maker Novavax (NASDAQ:NVAX) achieved this feat in 2020. You learn to live with the duds along the way because the winners more than compensate. Once in a long while, the odds are tipped even further in investors’ favor. On Monday, gene-editing firm Intellia (NASDAQ:NTLA) announced positive Phase 1 trial results of its treatment for a rare inherited liver disease. It’s a game-changer. We’re not just talking about CRISPR technology in crop breeding anymore — a market that is 0.6% of U.S. gross domestic product (GDP). Instead, we’re looking at healthcare, a segment that sucks up 17.7% of American GDP. And Intellia’s success marks the first time in-vivo gene editing has been proven safe for human use. Today, we’ll take a closer look at the winners of the gene therapy race and the firms that are losing out along the way. It’s rare to see your Mr. Moonshot excited about anything besides… well… Moonshots. But Intellia’s Phase 1 results were extraordinary. Drug platforms can take years to develop — it’s the reason why scientists were stunned that two companies created working mRNA vaccines at the same time to combat Covid-19. This weekend heralded even more good news for biotech. In a landmark Phase 1 trial, Intellia proved that gene editing could be safe (and potentially effective) at treating genetic orders. Its shares are up more than 50%. And it’s not too late to jump in. NTLA’s success doesn’t stem from its efficacy — MIT scientists have used in-vivo CRISPR technologies on mice since 2014. Instead, the treatment’s proven safety means those benefits could soon translate into human treatments too. That’s excellent news for the “big-3” of gene editing treatments. Intellia (NTLA). In addition to liver disorders, the gene-editing firm is also researching in-vivo treatments for hereditary angioedema and hemophilia. Editas Medicine (NASDAQ:EDIT). The seven-year-old company is working on several in-vivo candidates for ocular diseases and ex-vivo for sickle cell and cancer therapies. Crispr Therapeutics (NASDAQ:CRSP). The largest CRISPR biotech startup already has four ongoing clinical trials in hemophilia and cancer-beating drugs. Other research includes treatment for Type 1 diabetes, cystic fibrosis and Duchenne muscular dystrophy. Of course, it won’t be smooth sailing. Competition risks from mRNA vaccine makers are rising, particularly in oncology. And a lot can still go wrong in later phase CRISPR trials. But any winner could easily see their shares triple overnight. Falling to Earth: Mega-Cap Pharma Feel bad for Alnylam Pharmaceuticals (NASDAQ:ALNY) shareholders. Intellia’s good news sent its mRNA competitor’s shares down to $155 at one point. But the existential healthcare crisis runs deeper. Shares of large-cap healthcare companies have stalled. U.S. pharmaceuticals, represented by the IHE (NYSEARCA:IHE) exchange-traded fund (ETF), have risen only 28% in the past five years. Meanwhile, biotech and healthcare providers have motored ahead with 86% and 111% gains, respectively. The problem? Large-cap pharma companies are finding it harder than ever to profit from small-molecule drugs. Companies like Pfizer (NYSE:PFE) have struggled for years to replace cash cows like Lipitor and Viagra. The consolidating healthcare insurance market has also made it harder for drug firms to raise prices. In its place, pharma has increasingly relied on M&A (mergers and acquisitions) to fill its pipeline. Investors haven’t been pleased. On Monday, shares in Regeneron (NASDAQ:REGN) sank 1% even as its partner, Intellia, notched double-digit gains. Investors are presumably worried Regeneron will now have to make an M&A offer that Intellia shareholders can’t refuse. My advice? Steer clear of legacy drug firms; buying biotech is a more direct way to tap into upside. And what if you want exposure to the marketing side of pharma? Consider higher-margin pharmacy benefit manager (PBM) companies instead.

#### **CRISPR K2 pharma research and R&D for future drugs and medicines—pharma already knows and is investing in CRISPR infrastructure already.**

Enzmann and Wronski 19

Brittany L. Enzmann, PhD and Ania Wronski, PhD; scientific communications manager and engineered cells product manager at Synthego; “How CRISPR Is Accelerating Drug Discovery”; Genetic Engineering & Biotech News; January 11, 2019, 2021; <https://www.genengnews.com/insights/how-crispr-is-accelerating-drug-discovery/>; EMJ

CRISPR holds tremendous potential in advancing pharmacological research, with its impact spanning the entire preclinical drug discovery pipeline. Because CRISPR makes gene editing more tractable and precise, drug targets can be identified faster, and disease models can be generated that are more realistic. An increasing number of collaborations between industry and academia are sure to further advance the role of CRISPR in drug development. Pharmaceutical companies are also investing in CRISPR infrastructure to develop the next generation of drugs. In parallel, CRISPR is also being used to develop novel gene- and cell-based therapies that modulate genes directly within the patient or through ex vivo methods. For example, chimeric antigen receptor T (CAR-T) cells are being engineered to target cancer. CRISPR not only holds promise for developing therapies faster and at lower cost, but also facilitates the advancement of personalized medicine. Soon, the tailoring of therapies to individual patients may no longer be just an idea, but a distinct reality.

**Biopharmaceutical innovation is key to prevent future pandemics and bioterror**

**Marjanovic and Feijao 20** [Sonja Marjanovic Ph.D., Judge Business School, University of Cambridge. Carolina Feijao, Ph.D. in biochemistry, University of Cambridge; M.Sc. in quantitative biology, Imperial College London; B.Sc. in biology, University of Lisbon. "How to Best Enable Pharma Innovation Beyond the COVID-19 Crisis," RAND Corporation, 05-2020, accessed 8-8-2021, https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PEA407-1.html] HWIC

As key actors in the healthcare innovation landscape, pharmaceutical and life sciences companies have been called on to develop medicines, vaccines and diagnostics for pressing public health challenges. The COVID-19 crisis is one such challenge, but there are many others. For example, MERS, SARS, Ebola, Zika and avian and swine flu are also infectious diseases that represent public health threats. Infectious agents such as anthrax, smallpox and tularemia could present threats in a bioterrorism context.1 The general threat to public health that is posed by antimicrobial resistance is also well-recognised as an area in need of pharmaceutical innovation. Innovating in response to these challenges does not always align well with pharmaceutical industry commercial models, shareholder expectations and competition within the industry. However, the expertise, networks and infrastructure that industry has within its reach, as well as public expectations and the moral imperative, make pharmaceutical companies and the wider life sciences sector an indispensable partner in the search for solutions that save lives. This perspective argues for the need to establish more sustainable and scalable ways of incentivising pharmaceutical innovation in response to infectious disease threats to public health. It considers both past and current examples of efforts to mobilise pharmaceutical innovation in high commercial risk areas, including in the context of current efforts to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. In global pandemic crises like COVID-19, the urgency and scale of the crisis – as well as the spotlight placed on pharmaceutical companies – mean that contributing to the search for effective medicines, vaccines or diagnostics is essential for socially responsible companies in the sector. 2 It is therefore unsurprising that we are seeing industry-wide efforts unfold at unprecedented scale and pace. Whereas there is always scope for more activity, industry is currently contributing in a variety of ways. Examples include pharmaceutical companies donating existing compounds to assess their utility in the fight against COVID19; screening existing compound libraries in-house or with partners to see if they can be repurposed; accelerating trials for potentially effective medicine or vaccine candidates; and in some cases rapidly accelerating in-house research and development to discover new treatments or vaccine agents and develop diagnostics tests.3,4 Pharmaceutical companies are collaborating with each other in some of these efforts and participating in global R&D partnerships (such as the Innovative Medicines Initiative effort to accelerate the development of potential therapies for COVID-19) and supporting national efforts to expand diagnosis and testing capacity and ensure affordable and ready access to potential solutions.3,5,6 The primary purpose of such innovation is to benefit patients and wider population health. Although there are also reputational benefits from involvement that can be realised across the industry, there are likely to be relatively few companies that are ‘commercial’ winners. Those who might gain substantial revenues will be under pressure not to be seen as profiting from the pandemic. In the United Kingdom for example, GSK has stated that it does not expect to profit from its COVID-19 related activities and that any gains will be invested in supporting research and long-term pandemic preparedness, as well as in developing products that would be affordable in the world’s poorest countries.7 Similarly, in the United States AbbVie has waived intellectual property rights for an existing combination product that is being tested for therapeutic potential against COVID-19, which would support affordability and allow for a supply of generics.8,9 Johnson & Johnson has stated that its potential vaccine – which is expected to begin trials – will be available on a not-for-profit basis during the pandemic.10 Pharma is mobilising substantial efforts to rise to the COVID-19 challenge at hand. However, we need to consider how pharmaceutical innovation for responding to emerging infectious diseases can best be enabled beyond the current crisis. Many public health threats (including those associated with other infectious diseases, bioterrorism agents and antimicrobial resistance) are urgently in need of pharmaceutical innovation, even if their impacts are not as visible to society as COVID-19 is in the immediate term. The pharmaceutical industry has responded to previous public health emergencies associated with infectious disease in recent times – for example those associated with Ebola and Zika outbreaks.11 However, it has done so to a lesser scale than for COVID-19 and with contributions from fewer companies. Similarly, levels of activity in response to the threat of antimicrobial resistance are still low.12 There are important policy questions as to whether – and how – industry could engage with such public health threats to an even greater extent under improved innovation conditions.

**That causes extinction, which outweighs.**

**Millett & Snyder-Beattie ‘17**. Millett, Ph.D., Senior Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford; and Snyder-Beattie, M.S., Director of Research, Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford. 08-01-2017. “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity,” Health Security, 15(4), PubMed

In the decades to come, advanced bioweapons could **threaten human existence**. Although the **probability** of human extinction from bioweapons **may** be low, the **expected value** of **reducing** the risk could **still** be **large**, since such risks jeopardize the existence of **all future generations**. We provide an overview of biotechnological extinction risk, make some rough initial estimates for how severe the risks might be, and compare the cost-effectiveness of reducing these extinction-level risks with existing biosecurity work. We find that reducing human extinction risk can be more cost-effective than reducing smaller-scale risks, even when using conservative estimates. This suggests that the risks are not low enough to ignore and that more ought to be done to prevent the worst-case scenarios. How worthwhile is it spending resources to study and mitigate the chance of human extinction from biological risks? The risks of such a catastrophe are presumably low, so a skeptic might argue that addressing such risks would be a waste of scarce resources. In this article, we investigate this position using a cost-effectiveness approach and ultimately conclude that the expected value of reducing these risks is large, especially since such risks jeopardize the existence of all future human lives. **Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls** on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3 while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world's population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization. A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to **remote populations**, overcome **rare genetic resistances**, and **evade detection**, cures, and **countermeasures**. Even evolution itself may work in humanity's favor: **Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off**, and so **evolutionary pressures** could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6 While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they **do not rule** the possibility **out** entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of **species going extinct due to disease**—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also **historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out** by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include **native American tribes** exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and the Western Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population).9 In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But **many diseases are proof** of principle that **each worst-case attribute can be realized independently**. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, **natural evolution** would be an **unlikely** source for pathogens with the **highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach**. But **advances in biotech**nology might allow the creation of diseases that **combine such traits**. Recent controversy has **already emerged** over a number of **scientific experiments** that resulted in viruses with enhanced **transmissibility**, **lethality**, and/or the ability to overcome **therapeutics**.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-21 Although these experiments had scientific merit and were not conducted with malicious intent, their implications are still worrying. This is especially true given that there is also a **long historical track record** of**state-run bioweapon research** applying cutting-edge science and technology to design agents not previously seen in nature. The Soviet bioweapons program developed agents with traits such as enhanced virulence, resistance to therapies, greater environmental resilience, increased difficulty to diagnose or treat, and which caused unexpected disease presentations and outcomes.22 Delivery capabilities have also been subject to the cutting edge of technical development, with Canadian, US, and UK bioweapon efforts playing a critical role in developing the discipline of aerobiology.23,24 While there is no evidence of state-run bioweapons programs directly attempting to develop or deploy bioweapons that would pose an existential risk, the logic of deterrence and **m**utually **a**ssured **d**estruction could create such incentives in more unstable political environments or following a breakdown of the Biological Weapons Convention.25 The **possibility of a war** between great powers could also increase the pressure to use such weapons—during the World Wars, bioweapons were used across multiple continents, with Germany targeting animals in WWI,26 and Japan using plague to cause an epidemic in China during WWII.27

### 1NC WTO CP

#### 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 reduce IP protections for Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats

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 Heg Bad

#### Eliminating the WTO ends U.S. global hegemony

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.

Aff doesn’t solve for reducing TRIPs because it only reduces med patents—it isn’t crucial to US Heg.

#### 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.

### 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 Genomics

#### No solvency- the plan doesn’t solve non-medical or non human patents like Agriculture which is what the majority of their “dispute” evidence is about

#### COVID proves patents don’t stop research

Isaacson 21

(Walter, <https://www.statnews.com/2021/03/03/crispr-rivals-put-patents-aside-fight-against-covid-19/>, 3-3)

In January 2013, Zhang and Church published answers just a few weeks before Doudna did. Ever since then, Doudna and Zhang have been entangled in a complex and bitter battle over patents and prizes. In October 2020, Doudna and Charpentier won the Nobel Prize in chemistry, but the patent battles are still raging. When the two sides turned their attention to the coronavirus, though, they raced with similar intensity but this time decided to allow their discoveries to be used openly and without patent licensing for anyone fighting the Covid-19 pandemic.

#### Patents don’t hamper research, plan causes a shift to trade secrets

Cynober 19

(Timothe, Former regulatory scientist at Voisin Consulting Life Sciences in Paris. <https://www.labiotech.eu/in-depth/crispr-patent-dispute-licensing/>, 11-2)

As more and more patents are granted, individual patent claims will become narrower and might have less value, which would make them harder to enforce. In this context, it is difficult to evaluate the weight of each patent for each technology and application. This situation may prompt some to rely on trade secrets to protect their assets rather than on patent protection.

#### Alternatives to CRISPR solve

Reader 20

(Ruth, https://www.fastcompany.com/90561762/nobel-prize-jennifer-doudna-emmanuelle-charpentier-crispr-patent-lawsuit)

That litigation hasn’t entirely stopped CRISPR exploration. In fact, a whole industry of apparatuses and chemicals has emerged to facilitate CRISPR gene edits. CRISPR Cas-9 is showing promising results as a treatment for rare diseases such as sickle cell anemia as well as an implement for biomanufacturing. But the litigation may be shifting gene-editing research. Like any technology, CRISPR Cas-9 is not perfect. It’s not as precise as some scientists would like, and it can have unanticipated effects outside of the desired outcome. Scientists who don’t already have a claim to the CRISPR Cas-9 system may be more inclined to seek out other gene-editing opportunities rather than improve Cas-9. Conley says scientists may be wary of pushing the technology ahead. “It has absolutely put fear in the minds of many scientists who frankly could do great things for society,” says Conley. “They are living in terror of, well, if I go down this road a) am I going to be sued? And b) is there any commercial outlet where I’m going to have trouble raising money, because there’s fear and loathing around the CRISPR component?” Much of the new science surrounding CRISPR Cas-9 has come from scientists with a stake in the intellectual property. Last year, David Liu, a scientist at the Broad Institute and cofounder of gene-editing therapeutics company Editas Medicine, published a way of making more precise edits with fewer unintended effects using a new process called prime editing. One of Doudna’s companies, Scribe Therapeutics, is engineering CRISPR molecules, rather than using the ones found in nature, in order to do away with the natural aspects that get in the way of putting it to good use as a targeted gene editor. The company just raised $20 million and signed a deal with pharmaceutical company Biogen to implement its technology. Meanwhile, many researchers are seeking alternative gene-editing mechanisms, whether because of the litigation or because of the imperfection of CRISPR Cas-9 itself. There is an effort to find enzymes that perform many of the same cutting functions as the Cas-9 protein but are less entrenched in a legal morass. Conley thinks that eventually this avenue of research will push gene editing far beyond what CRISPR Cas-9 is capable of.

#### SQ Voluntary licensing solves

GenomeWeb 3-10-21 https://www.genomeweb.com/business-news/ers-genomics-licenses-crispr-patents-setsuro-tech#.YTTye45KhhE

ERS Genomics said on Wednesday that it has granted Japanese biotechnology startup Setsuro Tech a non-exclusive license to its CRISPR-Cas9 patent portfolio in Japan, which Setsuro said it will use to develop and supply cell and animal models. Financial and other terms of the deal were not disclosed. Dublin-based ERS Genomics was founded to provide access to CRISPR-Cas9 intellectual property held by Emmanuelle Charpentier. The IP is shared between her, Jennifer Doudna and the University of California, and the University of Vienna and is separate from genome editing patents held by the Broad Institute. Setsuro has developed a high-throughput genome editing method for mammalian embryos, which it calls genome editing by electroporation of Cas9 protein (GEEP). Using this method, the company is able to rapidly produce genetically engineered mice at low cost. Setsuro said it plans to use the ERS CRISPR technology to create genome-edited cell and animal models based on its customers' requirements. "Our technology enables us to provide researchers with genome-edited models quickly and at relatively low cost," Setsuro CEO Shinichiro Takezawa said in a statement. "The license from ERS expands our portfolio and having access to advanced technologies such as CRISPR-Cas9 will allow us to continue our high-quality offerings that combine CRISPR-Cas9 with our patent-pending technologies." ERS has signed many similar licensing deals for its CRISPR-Cas9 patent portfolio. Its most recent agreement was with Japanese drugmaker Otsuka Pharmaceutical at the beginning of March, for Otsuka's internal research and development programs to address areas of unmet medical need.

#### Sub-licensing and “safe harbor” provisions mean patents don’t deter research

Mullin 16

(Emily is a science and biotech journalist based in Maryland. <https://www.technologyreview.com/2016/12/13/155448/crispr-patent-outcome-wont-slow-innovation/> 12-13)

Last week a panel of judges at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in Alexandria, Virginia, heard arguments as to who should own the rights to the century’s biggest biotechnology invention to date, a precise gene-editing system called CRISPR-Cas9 that has the potential to treat serious human genetic disorders and create designer crops that resist drought and pathogens. Embroiled in the dispute are the Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, which holds 13 CRISPR-related patents, and the University of California, Berkeley, which believes it is the true inventor of the technology. Groups at the two universities are fighting for ownership of CRISPR gene editing in eukaryotic cells (those of humans, plants, and animals), which represents the most lucrative uses of the technology. At stake are billions of dollars tied up in numerous commercial agreements with biomedical and agricultural companies. The outcome of the so-called patent interference could render some of those contracts invalid. But the patent judges’ decision—expected in early 2017—is not likely to put any CRISPR companies out of business or even slow the lightning pace of research and development in commercial laboratories, experts say. “The success or failure of any company is not determined by patents alone,” says Mark Shtilerman, an intellectual-property lawyer at Deerfield Management, which has invested $20 million in Editas Medicine. Rather, he says, a company’s pipeline is more important. While Editas has exclusive licensing rights to use CRISPR technology from the Broad Institute to make medical treatments, other companies, including Intellia Therapeutics, CRISPR Therapeutics, and Caribou Biosciences, hold licenses or sublicenses to the rival intellectual property controlled by the University of California and several European inventors. Even with the fate of key patents up in the air, these companies have attracted a combined total of more than $1 billion in venture capital and are racing to develop therapeutics that use DNA editing to correct disease-causing genetic alterations. Editas, Intellia, and CRISPR Therapeutics declined to comment for this story. If the patent judges decide that the Broad is the official inventor of CRISPR and upholds all its patents, it’s likely that most other companies would then need to license the technology from the Broad or Editas, since these patents are fundamental to using CRISPR in eukaryotic cells, Shtilerman says. But it’s possible the judges could rule in favor of the University of California, in which case Editas and other companies aligned with the Broad would have to negotiate new license agreements. Harvard genetics professor George Church, a CRISPR researcher who is also a founding member of Editas, says he hopes that if the Broad wins, Editas will grant what is known as a sublicense to other companies developing CRISPR-related biotech drugs so they can “get on with their work.” He says he would be surprised if the winner of the patent battle didn’t dole out such licenses. “I don’t see the point in having winners and losers,” Church says. The more companies working on this technology, the greater the chance for one of them to develop a blockbuster drug, he says. In exchange for a sublicense, companies would agree to share a certain portion of profits with the patent holder. In the agricultural sector, DuPont has licensed CRISPR technology from Caribou Biosciences, and Monsanto has licensed patents from the Broad Institute. DuPont is already working to commercialize a CRISPR-edited corn product that it says will be available in five years. Neal Gutterson, vice president of research and development at DuPont Pioneer, said in a statement that the company does not speculate on ongoing legal proceedings. But he acknowledged that DuPont “has a strategy in place to position our business as a leader in the application of CRISPR-Cas in agriculture.” Colleen Tracy James, an intellectual-property lawyer specializing in life sciences at the firm Mayer Brown, says it could take as little as a few weeks for companies to negotiate and get a new license from the official inventor, if needed. She says the winner “has an incentive to do it quickly and get the revenue.” A third possible outcome of the patent hearing is that the judges could award patent rights to both the Broad Institute and the University of California. In that case, the companies licensing CRISPR technology would need to determine which institution owns the rights to the specific application they are using. Until then, companies developing potentially life-saving drugs are legally protected under what’s known as a “safe harbor” exemption, Shtilerman says. The exemption means that companies can conduct research using a patented invention even if they don’t hold a license to use that technology.

#### Turn: the Aff makes CRISPR inaccessible by decreasing innovation.

Pethokoukis 20

James Pethokoukis; Senior Fellow, Editor at AEIdeas Blog, DeWitt Wallace Chair; “Thinking about the CRISPR revolution and economic growth”; American Enterprise Institute; November 2, 2020, 2021; <https://www.genengnews.com/insights/how-crispr-is-accelerating-drug-discovery/>; EMJ

Future generations and historians may look back at the first part of the 21st century as the emerging Age of AI — but also maybe the Age of Gene Editing. Thanks to the revolutionary molecular scissors of CRISPR, humanity can now go into its cells and stitch in a gene sequence to create new therapies to fight cancer, design disease-resistant crops, and perhaps end hereditary disease in humans, including cystic fibrosis, muscular dystrophy, and Huntington’s Disease. (That is, so long as geneticists can fix recently discovered issues in the embryo-editing process.) We focus so much on the financial costs of healthcare that perhaps we underfocus on the benefits of health innovation, everything from public sanitation to drugs. As Kevin M. Murphy and Robert H. Topel calculate in a 2005 paper: “Over the 20th century, cumulative gains in life expectancy were worth over $1.2 million per person for both men and women. Between 1970 and 2000 increased longevity added about $3.2 trillion per year to national wealth, an uncounted value equal to about half of average annual GDP over the period. Reduced mortality from heart disease alone has increased the value of life by about $1.5 trillion per year since 1970. The potential gains from future innovations in health care are also extremely large. Even a modest 1 percent reduction in cancer mortality would be worth nearly $500 billion.” Again, while we often discuss the effect of income and wealth on healthcare, it also works the other way around. In 2004, Merck pulled Vioxx — one of the mostly widely prescribed painkillers known as Cox-2 inhibitors — after it was revealed that the drug increased the risk of heart attacks and strokes. But there was a trade-off for that action, one that shows how medical innovation can affect our living standards and economic outcomes. The Vioxx removal, along with the subsequent reduction in the use of all Cox-2 inhibitors, decreased the probability of working for an affected individual by 22 percentage points, according to the 2012 paper “The Economic Benefits of Pharmaceutical Innovations: The Case of Cox-2 Inhibitors” by Craig L. Garthwaite. Moreover, these estimates suggest that $19 billion in wages were lost in the year following the removal of Cox-2. Garthwait: “Inhibitors had an economically and statistically significant impact on labor supply in the United States. These medications are only one example of a medical advancement that has a demonstrable economic impact.” Of course, costs matter. And innovation can help there, as well. That is why I found so interesting this recent Financial Times interview with CRISPR pioneer Jennifer Doudna, the American biochemist who, along with French microbiologist and research partner Emmanuelle Charpentier, was awarded the 2020 Nobel Prize for chemistry. From the FT: “How can [Doudna] make sure Crispr is not prohibitively expensive? Her answer is simple: with more innovation. ‘The more efficiently you can do the editing, the more effectively you can deliver editors into cells, whether plant cells or the human brain or anything else, the better it will work, and the more you can control cost,’ she says. ‘I guess I’ve grown up in a capitalist society where you believe that as technologies become more capable, that it enables more companies to do interesting things and then it drives down cost and we’ve seen this over and over.’ She points to the iPhone as an example of a technology that was once the stuff of sci-fi and is now widely available.” And, of course, innovation might move beyond the gene editing techniques of CRISPR to even more revolutionary results. This from my podcast chat with Kevin Davies, executive editor of The CRISPR Journal and the founding editor of Nature Genetics. He is also the author of Editing Humanity: The CRISPR Revolution and the New Era of Genome Editing.

#### The WTO’s biggest crisis in history was due to the US preventing new judges from being nominated to the appeal court- this means collapse happens regardless of solving for patent conflicts

Tobin 19 [Meaghan Tobin has nearly a decade of experience spanning journalism and public policy in Washington, Taipei and Beijing. She covered geopolitics, diplomacy and policy trends in Southeast Asia and the Pacific for the Post until April 2020. “The US has crippled the WTO’s appeal court. What does this mean for Asia?” December 18, 2019. <https://www.scmp.com/week-asia/explained/article/3042511/us-has-crippled-wtos-appeal-court-what-does-mean-asia>] AL

The United States’ decision last week to block the nomination of new judges to the World Trade Organisation’s appeal court – effectively crippling it – sees the organisation facing what experts warn is the biggest crisis in its 25-year history. The judgment of the court allows countries to slap tariffs and other penalties on those who do not abide by the rules of global trade – and without it, economists worry the world’s trade watchdog has finally been defanged. The WTO was set up in 1995 to give countries a framework for governing global trade, and today sets the rules for 96 per cent of it. The organisation’s rules, and the knowledge that its 164 members agree to play by them, keep trade barriers between countries low and create stability for investors. Without the threat of the appeal court’s judgment to keep countries in check, trade officials warn the international trading system has lost its impartial arbitrator – and could splinter into tit-for-tat spats such as the trade war between the US and China. More than 20 per cent of WTO disputes have been brought by nations in Asia, leaving the region vulnerable if trade rules become tougher to enforce. Japan, India, China and South Korea have been among the most active users of the WTO’s dispute settlement system, and the collapse of the appeals body leaves multiple cases in limbo. In remarks last week, China’s Foreign Ministry spokesperson Hua Chunying called the collapse of the appeals body “the most severe blow to the multilateral trading system since the establishment of the WTO”. What happened to the WTO’s appeal court? Though the US has been by far the most active user of the WTO’s dispute settlement system – lodging more than 20 per cent of cases in the body’s history – it was Washington’s decision to constrict it. The appeal court needs a minimum of three judges to take on new cases, but last week the terms of two expired with no one to take their place. The US has blocked the nomination of new judges for more than two years, partly out of what Washington officials have described as a desire to force the institution to reform. The term of the last remaining judge, China’s Hong Zhao, expires in November 2020. The two outgoing judges plan to stay on to complete three more decisions, but a further 10 cases, including two involving South Korea, will be left in limbo. One of the cases is against the US for its imposition of high anti-dumping tariffs, and the other was filed by Tokyo against Seoul for its tariffs on stainless steel. Yose Rizal Damuri, head of the department of economics at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Jakarta, said the appeals body was important in giving recourse to countries that had lost disputes. Until an appeals case has been settled, any decision which has gone through WTO dispute settlement does not have any legal force. “If the appellate body isn’t functioning, this makes the multilateral trading system uncertain,” said Yose. “It reduces the credibility of the WTO.” China’s President Xi Jinping has called for China to step up as a guardian of multilateralism, and Beijing has backed the EU’s calls for a free international trading order.

#### The WTO more closely working with other big organizations like the UN fixes its major problems, solving the entirety of Aff impacts

Murphy-Gregory 15

Hannah Murphy-Gregory, (PhD PoliSci and lecturer), 30 nov 2015, "What's Wrong with the WTO and How to Fix It," Australian Institute of International Affairs, https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/australianoutlook/whats-wrong-with-the-wto-and-how-to-fix-it/ // AW

The multilateral trading system governed by the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is in serious trouble. In this book, Rorden Wilkinson makes the case that the WTO, as it stands today, is an institution that is not fit for its stated purpose, achieves too little in the way of multilateral trade agreements and exacerbates inequalities between wealthy and developing countries. Moreover, the way in which trade negotiations have been constructed by media reporting and commentary adds to the malaise. Unlike the majority of WTO reform proposals that err on the side of incrementalism, Wilkinson offers up a more radical plan to rebuild the WTO in order to better serve the interests of both the developed and the developing world. His vision is for a more equitable institution that harnesses global trade for development and whilst such rhetoric has surrounded the Doha Development Agenda, the results thus far have been dismal. Wilkinson’s outline of the way in which the WTO actually operates is an antidote to both more rosy accounts of the WTO’s achievements as well as more technical discussions of negotiating rules and norms and the WTO dispute settlement process, the latter of which dominate the scholarly literature. This will come as a relief to both academic readers and those interested in obtaining a better understanding of the mechanics of trade negotiations. Through part I of the book entitled ‘Problems’, the author traces the historical development of the multilateral trading system from its shaky start (the stillbirth of the International Trade Organisation), the operating procedures of GATT and the eventual establishment of the WTO in 1995. Throughout this analysis, Wilkinson adeptly highlights that the multilateral trade regime is an exercise of power by the wealthy industrialised states to the detriment of developing countries. Having dissected and distilled the operations of the WTO, Wilkinson calls for a new, more socially progressive institution that will see trade liberalisation not as a goal unto itself but as a means to realising global social goods such as greater equality between the rich and the poor and the preservation of the global environment. In part II, ‘Solutions’, Wilkinson reviews and categorises recent WTO reform proposals, finding that most are too cautious and do not challenge the power inequalities embedded in the WTO’s institutional design. Instead, Wilkinson argues that the WTO must be understood as a mechanism to fulfil social aspirations via a reconfigured mission statement, closer collaboration with the UN institutions and a shift from adversarial relationships between members to **incentives-based governance that promotes economic growth via trade and technology transfer**. Most interestingly, Wilkinson argues that states would not be the chief parties to the organisation “but rather geographic areas and specific agents within, between and across states”. Of course, the most difficult aspect of rebuilding the WTO is working out how to implement change. Several discrete steps towards change are put forward including constructing a new narrative, increasing public debate via a global public forum on trade and suggestions about how to mobilise the WTO’s existing architecture.