# Speech 1NC Grapevine Rd 1 vs Southlake 9-10 3PM

## 1

#### Interp: the aff disclose all changes

#### Violation: screenshots

Shape

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

#### Standards

#### A~ Pre round prep- Hiding changes mean that pre round neg prep was skewed—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update our answers to the aff

#### B~ academic integrity – disclosing changes is key to ensure that new evidence isn't miscut and we have an idea of what analytics will look like

## 2

#### Interp – affs must specify intellectual property in a delineated text in the 1AC. To clarify, you can defend whole rez but you just have to specify what IP is.

#### IP is flexible and has too many interps – normal means shows no consensus and makes the round irresolvable since the judge doesn’t know how to compare between types of offense and OW since it’s a side constraint on decision making.

Saha and Bhattacharya 11 [Chandra Nath Saha (Quality Assurance Department, Claris Lifesciences Ltd) and Sanjib Bhattacharya (Pharmacognosy Division, Bengal School of Technology, A College of Pharmacy). “Intellectual property rights: An overview and implications in pharmaceutical industry”. Journal of Advanced Pharmaceutical Technology Research. 2011 Apr-Jun; 2(2): 88–93. Accessed 7/30/21. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3217699/> //Xu]

It is obvious that management of IP and IPR is a multidimensional task and calls for many different actions and strategies which need to be aligned with national laws and international treaties and practices. It is no longer driven purely by a national perspective. IP and its associated rights are seriously influenced by the market needs, market response, cost involved in translating IP into commercial venture and so on. In other words, trade and commerce considerations are important in the management of IPR. Different forms of IPR demand different treatment, handling, planning, and strategies and engagement of persons with different domain knowledge such as science, engineering, medicines, law, finance, marketing, and economics. Each industry should evolve its own IP policies, management style, strategies, etc. depending on its area of specialty. Pharmaceutical industry currently has an evolving IP strategy. Since there exists the increased possibility that some IPR are invalid, antitrust law, therefore, needs to step in to ensure that invalid rights are not being unlawfully asserted to establish and maintain illegitimate, albeit limited, monopolies within the pharmaceutical industry. Still many things remain to be resolved in this context.

#### Violation – you don’t.

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Stable Advocacy – they can redefine in the 1AR to wriggle out of DA’s which kills high-quality engagement and becomes two ships passing in the night – triggers presumption since the aff wasn’t subject to well researched scrutiny. We lose access to nuclear deterrence DA’s, Innovation DA’s, basic case turns, and core process counter plans that have different definitions and 1NC pre-round prep.

#### 2] Real World – policy makers will always define the entity that they are prohibiting. It also means zero solvency, absent spec, actors circumvent since there’s no specific object of the plan and means their solvency can’t actualize.

#### IP spec isn’t regressive or arbitrary – its core topic lit for what happens when the aff is implemented and cannot be discounted from prohibition policies that require enforcement to function.

#### Fairness – its constitutive to debate as competitive activity that requires objective evaluation

#### Education –it’s the only portable impact to debate

#### CI – a) brightlines are arbitrary and self-serving which doesn’t set good norms b) it collapses since weighing between brightlines rely on offense defense

#### No RVI’s- a) logic – you shouldn’t win for being fair b) clash – people go all in on theory which decks substance engagement c) chilling effect – people will be too scared to read theory because RVI’s encourage baiting theory

#### Neg theory is drop the debater – a) Prep skew – aff’s infinite prep means they can frontline every shell marginally enough to be efficient at DA and skew substance enough to deflate theory and win b) 1AR Flex – It’s key to check 1ar flexibility since you can moot all 6 min of my offense and restart the debate on unpredictable layers while kicking the arguments that were abusive.

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier.

## 3

#### The ROB is to determine the truth of falsity of the resolution –

#### 1] Textuality – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true.

#### That OW –

#### a] Jurisdiction – judges are constrained through their constitutive purpose and proves it’s a side constraint on what arguments they can vote on.

#### b] Predictability – people base prep off the pregiven terms in the resolution.

#### 2] Isomorphism – alternative ROBs aren’t binary truth/false because of topic lit biases which increases intervention and takes the debate out of the hands of debaters.

#### 3] Inclusion – any offense functions under it as long as debaters implicate their positions to prove the truth or falsity of the resolution which maximizes substantive clash through ground and is a sequencing question for engaging in debate.

#### 4] Logic – any statement relies on a conception of truth to function – for example, I’m hungry is the same as its true that I’m hungry – logic is a litmus test for any argument and proves your ROB collapse since it relies on truth.

#### Presumption and permissibility negates – a) more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted – there’s alwahys an institutional DA to going through Congress c) ought[[3]](#footnote-3) means “moral obligation” so the lack of that obligation means the aff hasn’t fulfilled their burden

#### Negate –

#### 1] member[[4]](#footnote-4) is “a part or organ of the body, especially a limb” but an organ can’t have obligations

#### 2] of[[5]](#footnote-5) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 3] the[[6]](#footnote-6) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

#### 4] to[[7]](#footnote-7) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### 5] reduce[[8]](#footnote-8) is to “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.

#### 6] for[[9]](#footnote-9) is “in place of” but medicines aren’t replacing IP.

#### 7] medicine[[10]](#footnote-10) is “(especially among some North American Indian peoples) a spell, charm, or fetish believed to have healing, protective, or other power” but you can’t have IP for a spell.

## 4

#### Ethics must be derived from practical reason –

#### 1] Action Theory – any action can be divided into infinite parts. Any other theory is incoherent because there are infinite ends to look to. Prefer reason because it’s the only thing unifying all those actions.

#### 2] Is-Ought Gap – descriptive claims cannot prescribe action – “arsenic is poison” doesn’t mean “one ought not drink arsenic” because it doesn’t ought to be that way. Only a nonnatural a priori premise can form ought statements.

#### 3] Infinite Regress – We can ask why for any other framework but to ask why for reasons concedes the authority of reasons which means they are inescapable and binding and outweighs because they are the only ones that can guide action which is the purpose of ethics.

#### 4] External Worlds Fallacy- the only thing constitutive to subjectivity is reason. I could be a brain in a vat but so all other forms of knowledge are unreliable and doubtful.

#### 5] Culpability – ethics assumes the agential ability for self-reflection – otherwise we could never determine whether someone was responsible for their actions meaning it’s the only way to generate a normative force.

#### Reason is universal and applies to everyone – it doesn’t make sense to say 2+2=4 for me but not for anyone else.

#### The standard is consistency with universalizable maxims –

#### 1] Performativity – when you enter debate, you presume that you will be free to set and pursue ends in the round because of a system of reciprocally enforced constraints.

#### 2] Ideal Theory Good –

#### a] end point – we’d constantly be fixing injustices as a precondition to ethical action so we never get to the bottom of what is actually ethical

#### b] relevance – every society has different injustices that occur – the resolution is a universal values statement which means you cannot universalize any theory under nonideal theory

#### 3] TJF –

#### A] phil ed

#### B] resource disparaties

#### Negate –

#### 1] IP rights are necessary for subject formation – creators are isolated and properly conceived under IP which is a sequencing question to understanding the function of agency.

Kanning 12 [Michael A. Kanning (Graduate School at University of South Florida). “A Philosophical Analysis of Intellectual Property: In Defense of Instrumentalism”. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts Department of Philosophy College of Arts and Sciences University of South Florida. January 2012. Accessed 8/22/21. <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=5290&context=etd> //Xu]

As noted previously in my discussion of the utilitarian justification, determining precisely how to maximize something like innovation or creative expression through the use of intellectual property is a difficult and complicated task. I have argued that this difficulty was not sufficient grounds to reject the utilitarian or instrumentalist accounts as a foundation. Much to the contrary, for the instrumentalist, this empirical task is the most important project in the analysis and development of intellectual property policies. One way to proceed in this analysis would be to engage in a kind of armchair economics, speculating about what motivates people to create, and then speculating about how institutions and rewards can be arranged to help encourage creative efforts. But this method is decidedly unempirical. Nonetheless, something like this is what is usually offered as a utilitarian justification - that intellectual property rights reward people who engage in costly and risky creative efforts. Without such a system of reward, we would not have as much creativity and innovation in the world. This is taken as an axiomatic truth. I do not intend to argue that this is false, only that is needs to be proven. The instrumentalist is committed to an empiricism that necessitates a more scientific and well-documented analysis about what best facilitates creative and innovative processes. This task cannot be taken up here. In fact, as Merges noted, there is much work already done in this area, but the verdict is still out. What can be done here is a brief conceptual analysis of the things that make up the creative process, broadly conceived. Most prominent in the rhetoric of intellectual property law is the concept of creator who serves as the ultimate or efficient cause of some new thing. As an illustration of this, recall that most of the classical justifications covered in Chapter 1 centered around a solitary creator, conceived of as a laborer (in Lockean theory), or as an self-contained individual or personality (in the Kantian and Hegelian theories). Creators, whether inventors, authors, artists or innovators, are isolated and identified, granted ownership rights and rewarded. If we are to have an ideally-functioning set of intellectual property laws that best achieve their established ends, it is important that creators are properly conceived of. A clear notion of the creative entity will allow us to ensure that whatever incentives or pecuniary rewards are distributed are done so in a way that best achieves the goals of the intellectual property system.

#### 2] IPR is well established under iLaw – it overwhelmingly negates.

Osei-Tutu 17 [Bracketed for G-Lang. Julia Janewa Osei-Tutu (she is the current Editor in Chief of the African Journal of Legal Studies, and one of the founding directors of the Center for International Law and Policy in Africa, Ghanaian-Canadian, Associate Professor of Law @ Florida International University, LL.M. from McGill University, J.D. from Queen’s University, B.A. from the University of Toronto. “Humanizing Intellectual Property: Moving Beyond the Natural Rights Property Focus”. Florida International University College of Law. 2017. Accessed 8/24/21. <https://ecollections.law.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1353&context=faculty_publications> //Xu]

There is an international human rights basis for claiming IP protection as a human right. 92 Both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) contain language that is suggestive of copyright and patent protection.93 Furthermore, European jurisprudence has recognized trademark and copyright property interests as human rights under the European Convention on Human Rights. 94 The UDHR is an important instrument because, although it is not a binding treaty, it is largely considered customary international law.9 5 Its status as customary international law means that it is part of the accepted law of nations.96 Article 27(2) of the UDHR states: "Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author." 97 Similar language is found in Article 15(1)(c) of the ICESCR, which also provides for the protection of material and moral interests.98 Arguably, Article 27 of the UDHR and Article 15 of the ICESCR acknowledge a human right to IP.99 In particular, copyright and patents seem to intersect with the human rights enunciated both in the UDHR and in the ICESCR. 100 Copyright protects literary and artistic works, while patents protect new, useful, and inventive products or processes. 101 The right to the protection of moral and material interests resulting from any scientific production of which one is the author is less clearly related to patents, trademarks, or copyrights than the rights related to literary and artistic works. 102 This is because a scientific production may not be the same thing as a new, useful, and non-obvious invention. However, the language of these human rights provisions has been interpreted as overlapping with patent protection as well. 103 The UDHR also recognizes property rights. 104 To the extent that patents, trademarks, copyrights, and other intangible rights are considered property, this provides an additional basis for claiming a human right to IP.105 The natural rights property-based IP model more closely aligns with the notion of an absolute right to property. 106 It is important to note, however, that property as a human right is not universally accepted.107

#### Two impacts –

#### A] cosmopolitanism

#### B] promise breaking

## 5

#### Infra passes now but there is no room for error – Pelosi depends on Republicans votes to pass but faces pressure.

Fox and Zanona 9/8 [Lauren Fox (congressional correspondent for CNN) and Melanie Zanona (CNN Capitol Hill reporter). “GOP pressure to block bipartisan infrastructure bill builds in the House”. CNN. Updated 10:18 PM ET, Wed September 8, 2021. Accessed 9/8/21. <https://www.cnn.com/2021/09/07/politics/bipartisan-infrastructure-bill-republican-support/index.html> //Xu]

House Republicans could face increased pressure to vote against a bipartisan infrastructure package when they return to Washington later this month with outside groups and conservatives already ramping up the campaign against a $1.2 trillion package they say would be akin to writing Democrats a blank check to restructure the social safety net. The dynamic in the House is far different than the one in the Senate just last month when 19 Republicans -- including the Minority Leader Mitch McConnell -- voted to pass legislation that enables the rebuilding of America's roads and bridges, bolsters the nation's broadband network and gives Republicans and Democrats alike a rare opportunity to point to a bipartisan accomplishment on the campaign trail next fall. For House Republicans, voting "yes" on the bipartisan bill later this month could be far more of a liability. Former President Donald Trump, who still carries unrivaled sway over the conference, has urged members to vote against it. Members of the hardline House Freedom Caucus have threatened to campaign against GOP colleagues who vote "yes," and outside conservative groups like the Club For Growth have already alerted members that they are urging a "no" vote. Republican Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene of Georgia -- who has already threatened to campaign against her "weak" Republican colleagues who back the $1.2 trillion package -- said GOP lawmakers should be "shamed and never voted for again" if they support the plan. Texas Rep. Chip Roy said he agreed, calling it "absurd" that 19 Senate Republicans backed the bill. Even the top Republican, House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy of California, has made clear he's opposed to the bipartisan bill in its current form, potentially forecasting an effort by leadership to sink the bill. "As I read the bill now, I could not support it," McCarthy recently said in an interview with Fox Business Network. "I have a great frustration with this bill." The Republican Study Committee, the largest conservative caucus in the House, began circulating a memo last month railing against the compromise bill. Members and aides say it's too early to know exactly how many Republican members could vote to advance the legislation or how much of a fight leadership will put up to defeat it, but aides so far predict the number of GOP votes in play would be just a few dozen. Unlike in the Senate where the bipartisan bill received a standalone vote weeks before a bigger, Democratic-only proposal was ready, in the House, the bipartisan bill is expected to come around the same time as Democrats prepare to vote on legislation that will expand federal health care programs, raise taxes and reimagine the social safety net. In order to satisfy her caucus, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi pledged early on not to move the bipartisan infrastructure bill until the House was finished with their bigger proposal, which Republicans say gave them opening to argue that the two bills, which are separate proposals, are inextricably linked. With just a three-vote margin, Pelosi has had to tread carefully to secure both moderate and progressive votes on both packages and has promised moderates she will bring the bipartisan bill to the floor no later than September 27, but Republicans aren't waiting until then to begin their effort to message against the bill. For months, the top Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, Rep. Kevin Brady of Texas, has been engaging members directly on how Democrats are using their reconciliation bill as the opportunity to repeal GOP tax cuts that were their signature accomplishment under Trump. Republicans on the committee have been operating a "war room" and working to educate members directly on the Democratic-only bill that would increase taxes for some Americans. "If they continue to be linked and they continue to be pushed as a package, it makes it pretty difficult for even pro infrastructure Republican like me to vote for it," Rep. Rodney Davis of Illinois, a top Republican on the House Transportation Committee and a member of the whip team, told CNN. Republicans say a lot of the outcome for the bipartisan bill depends on timing and when Pelosi brings up both pieces of the infrastructure agenda. "The biggest concern for most every Republican I've talked to is the fact that the $3.5 trillion package is still hanging out there as a villain," Rep. Dusty Johnson, a South Dakota Republican who serves as a whip for the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus, told CNN. "The fact that we might get a $3.5 trillion package passed at some time prior to, or shortly after, passing a trillion dollar infrastructure package, I mean that does complicate the path forward. There's no question." Democrats are hoping that the political benefits of voting "yes" on the bipartisan infrastructure package will be too tempting for key Republicans to pass up. A Fox News poll in August, for example, found that 62% of the public supported the $1.2 trillion package. For conservative members in safe red seats, a vote against the bipartisan infrastructure bill may be easier, but, for members in tough reelections, new investments in roads and bridges provide an easy and tangible way to prove to voters back home they are delivering for their district. Democrats also hope the recent natural disasters that have wreaked havoc across the country will renew the sense of urgency to invest in the nation's aging infrastructure. But there are no signs that Republicans have changed their minds in recent days. House Minority Whip Steve Scalise, whose home state of Louisiana has been ravaged by Hurricane Ida, is still expected to oppose the measure. "I'm against the far-left $5 trillion tax hike and Green New Deal scheme masquerading as an infrastructure bill," Scalise told CNN in a statement. And fellow Louisiana Republican Rep. Garret Graves said at a committee meeting last week that marking up trillions of dollars in spending for the reconciliation package was "ridiculous" and said the priorities of the committee were completely out of sync with what was needed in terms of how the federal response can be strengthened to respond to natural disasters. While many moderate Republicans may support the core contents of the bipartisan infrastructure bill, they also feel comfortable opposing the measure if it is seen as setting the stage for Democrats' massive spending package on social programs and climate change. It's unclear if and how many GOP votes Democrats would need to pass their bipartisan legislation. If Democrats remain united, they won't need any. But many progressives have yet to commit publicly to voting for the bipartisan bill. With that three-vote margin, Pelosi may need a handful of Republican votes to get the legislation across the finish line.

#### The plan sparks congressional infighting – waiving IP rights is incredibly unpopular among Congressional Republicans

Wild 5-21 Joff Wild 5-21-2021 "President Biden finds himself caught between a rock and a hard place on the covid vaccine IP waiver" <https://www.iam-media.com/law-policy/biden-waiver-rock-hard-place> (Editor-in-Chief of Intellectual Asset Management)//Elmer

It is increasingly clear that the Biden Administration's support for a covid vaccine IP waiver is going to come **with heavy political costs.** The only issue is which ones the president is most prepared to pay One of the golden rules of politics is never to make very public commitments you cannot keep. Another is to drop commitments quickly if fulfilling them will end up doing you more harm than good. Whether Joe Biden realises it yet or not, when it comes to his support for the covid vaccine IP waiver, he is soon going to have to choose which one of these rules to follow and which to ignore. Unfortunately for the US President, there is no pain free option available. The announcement by US Trade Representative Katherine Tai on 5th May of “the Biden-Harris Administration’s support for waiving intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines” won praise from governments and NGOs across the globe, as well as many inside the Democratic party in the US. “This is exactly the kind of leadership the world needs right now,” said Bernie Sanders. Médecins Sans Frontierés applauded the move; while South Africa’s president Cyril Ramaphosa hailed it as a “victory”. Reaction among the US IP owning community – in the life science sector and beyond – was less enthusiastic. Andrei Iancu’s response, revealed in Monday’s exclusive interview with IAM, was probably representative of the majority opinion. Calling the decision “dangerous” and “wrong for so many reasons”, the former USPTO Director argued that backing a waiver – effectively the retrospective removal of IP rights – crossed a dangerous red line. “Once you have taken this **genie out of the bottle**, it will be very hard to put it back in again,” he stated. Congressional Republicans have been even more scathing, with senators Tillis and Cotton describing the **administration’s move as “disastrous”.** On Wednesday, the pair **joined** a group of **their party** colleagues to ask a series of questions of Tai and Commerce Secretary Gina Raimundo that point clearly to the political direction the waiver debate is going to take. So far, so predictable. You’d expect the US left, NGOs and medium- and low-income countries to back the waiver. Opposition from the IP community and Republicans is also not a surprise. If this was where it ended, the administration would be home dry. Now, though, comes the need to deliver. And therein lies the challenge for the White House. Because the more you look at the practicalities of a waiver, the harder it becomes for the US to support one. Although most of the headlines have been about the suspension of covid-related patent rights, just about everyone who has looked at the issue – on whatever side of the argument they stand – has accepted that patents are not a meaningful barrier to covid vaccine production scale-up and roll-out. There are very few covid-related patents out there currently, there are even fewer in medium- and low-income countries, and for those that do exist there are already TRIPs-compliant compulsory licensing provisions that allow for march-in. If patents were the problem they could be overridden tomorrow. To the extent that IP may be an issue - as opposed to the lack of production facilities and raw materials - it’s the know-how required to work the various technologies behind the vaccines that is crucial. Or, in other words, the trade secrets that various life sciences companies possess. It’s these and how they protect knowledge related to manufacturing processes, data, supply lines and so on that are the true bones of contention. But here’s the rub: while the right to exclude that a patent allows for can be suspended and then reintroduced, once a trade secret is out there it cannot be taken back; instead, it is gone, forever. Does the Biden Administration really want to be party to an agreement that would force US companies, which have spent huge sums on R&D and on building-up levels of knowledge that give them a significant edge, being forced **to share it all with entities in China, Russia, India** and elsewhere, which have made no such investments but which could use what they have been handed to their competitive advantage? It seems highly unlikely. If it did, though, **the Republicans would make political hay**. Alternatively, however, having come out in favour of the waiver, any Biden Administration backtracking or prevarication would play terribly among the large sections of the Democratic party – especially on its left flank – that have been so supportive of the original call. Put another way, the White House has stuck itself between a rock and a hard place. It either signs up to giving away hugely valuable US know-how and IP, so causing significant damage to the country’s innovation economy and handing an electoral gift to the Republicans; or it doesn’t and so hugely disappoints an important portion of its base.

#### Infrastructure solves existential climate change – spill-over.

USA Today 7-20 [7-20-2021 "Climate change is at 'code red' status for the planet, and inaction is no longer an option". Editorial Board @ USA Today. Accessed 8/30/21. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/todaysdebate/2021/07/20/climate-change-biden-infrastructure-bill-good-start/7877118002/> //Recut Xu from Elmer]

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