# Speech 1NC Grapevine Trips vs St Agnes 9-11 7PM

## 1

#### 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.

## 2

#### Interpretation - Reduce means permanent reduction – it’s distinct from “waive” or “suspend.”

**Reynolds 59** (Judge (In the Matter of Doris A. Montesani, Petitioner, v. Arthur Levitt, as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al., Respondents [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL] Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department 9 A.D.2d 51; 189 N.Y.S.2d 695; 1959 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 7391 August 13, 1959, lexis)

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway.  [\*\*\*13] The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency.

#### Semantics first –

#### Outweighs –

#### a] Precision – they can arbitrarily jettison words which decks ground and preparation because there is no stasis point

#### b] Jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the authority to vote aff if it wasn’t legitimate

#### Violation – the aff isn’t permanent – 1AC Jones says a period of three years

#### Vote neg for limits and neg ground – re-instatement under any infinite number of conditions doubles aff ground – every plan becomes either temporary or permanent – you cherry-pick the best criteria and I must prep every aff while they avoid core topic discussions like reduction-based DAs which decks generics like Pharma Innovation and Bio-Tech.

## 3

#### Interp debaters may not misdislcose

#### Violation – they said that it would the aff they read against karan w changes to the uv and fw – that’s bullshit

Text

Description automatically generated

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

Text

Description automatically generated

#### engagibitliy

#### evidence ethics

#### evidence ethics Fairness – a) you conceded the judge will fairly evaluate your argument b) 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

#### 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.

#### 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

#### 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.

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology and 1st and last speech 3] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

## 4

#### The meta-ethic is egoism –

#### 1] Opacity – individuals can’t access another’s perspective – we can never fully understand who someone else is or what they think so actions are based off individual desire and self-interest.

#### 2] Hedonism – even if we know what is ethical, there’s nothing that binds us to ethical behavior or the best metric for maximizing those outcomes. Bindingness O/W – if morality is arbitrary, there’s no reason to follow it and can’t guide action.

#### 3] Psychology – fMRI studies prove there’s not unified temporal identity – we can only care about our current self-interests.

Opar 14 [Alisa Opar (features editor at Audubon magazine). “Why We Procrastinate”. Nautilus. August 14, 2014. Accessed 7/31/21. <https://nautil.us/issue/16/nothingness/why-we-procrastinate> //Recut Xu]

The British philosopher Derek Parfit espoused a severely reductionist view of personal identity in his seminal book, Reasons and Persons: It does not exist, at least not in the way we usually consider it. We humans, Parfit argued, are not a consistent identity moving through time, but a chain of successive selves, each tangentially linked to, and yet distinct from, the previous and subsequent ones. The boy who begins to smoke despite knowing that he may suffer from the habit decades later should not be judged harshly: “This boy does not identify with his future self,” Parfit wrote. “His attitude towards this future self is in some ways like his attitude to other people.” Parfit’s view was controversial even among philosophers. But psychologists are beginning to understand that it may accurately describe our attitudes towards our own decision-making: It turns out that we see our future selves as strangers. Though we will inevitably share their fates, the people we will become in a decade, quarter century, or more, are unknown to us. This impedes our ability to make good choices on their—which of course is our own—behalf. That bright, shiny New Year’s resolution? If you feel perfectly justified in breaking it, it may be because it feels like it was a promise someone else made. “It’s kind of a weird notion,” says Hal Hershfield, an assistant professor at New York University’s Stern School of Business. “On a psychological and emotional level we really consider that future self as if it’s another person.” Using fMRI, Hershfield and colleagues studied brain activity changes when people imagine their future and consider their present. They homed in on two areas of the brain called the medial prefrontal cortex and the rostral anterior cingulate cortex, which are more active when a subject thinks about himself than when he thinks of someone else. They found these same areas were more strongly activated when subjects thought of themselves today, than of themselves in the future. Their future self “felt” like somebody else. In fact, their neural activity when they described themselves in a decade was similar to that when they described Matt Damon or Natalie Portman. And subjects whose brain activity changed the most when they spoke about their future selves were the least likely to favor large long-term financial gains over small immediate ones. Emily Pronin, a psychologist at Princeton, has come to similar conclusions in her research. In a 2008 study, Pronin and her team told college students that they were taking part in an experiment on disgust that required drinking a conindivudcoction made of ketchup and soy sauce. The more they, their future selves, or other students consumed, they were told, the greater the benefit to science. Students who were told they’d have to down the distasteful quaff that day committed to consuming two tablespoons. But those that were committing their future selves (the following semester) or other students to participate agreed to guzzle an average of half a cup. We think of our future selves, says Pronin, like we think of others: in the third person.

#### Absent unification, competing claims collapses into the State of Nature –

#### 1] Ambiguity – individuals assert differing perspectives and culminates in irresolvable conflict absent a mediating force which renders truth and ethics indeterminate.

#### 2] Violence – individuals must act in self-preservation. Without a force to provide protection, each person acts violently to defend themselves, resulting in infinite uncontrolled violence.

#### The solution is the sovereign to enforce truth and law by acting as the ultimate ruler and eliminate conflict.

#### The standard is *consistency with absolute sovereignty*.

#### 1] TJF - morality’s a definition of the word ‘ought’ which means it can be evaluated as a topicality issue

#### a] Political Education – politicians have to understand the social contract in order to know what powers they have and what they have to provide citizens and debating about Hobbes helps us learn about that.

#### b] Topic Ed – the Hobbesian approach is ideal for dealing with IP in the context of public health disaster.

Ashcroft 05 [Richard E. Ashcroft (MA, PhD Reader in Biomedical Ethics in the Department of Primary Health Care and General Practice at Imperial College London). “Access to essential medicines: a Hobbesian social contract approach”. Dev World Bioeth. 2005 May;5(2):121-41. Accessed 7/31/2021. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15842722/> //Xu]

The problems I have described in these concluding remarks are serious and difficult. I do not think they are decisive. None of these problems demonstrate either the falsity or incoherence of a Hobbesian approach. Rather, they show that a Hobbesian approach needs further detailed development. I think that the merits of the Hobbesian approach are plain, so far as it takes serious notice of the features of the state of war, the instrumental nature of states and their legal and civil institutions, and the overarching objective of states to preserve their citizens from misery and disaster. More obviously ‘moral’ theories (such as utilitarian theory, or natural rights theories such as Lockean theory or modern human rights theories) are less illuminating, in that they fail to construct compelling perfect obligations lying with specific agents. The Hobbesian account I have constructed here has many loose ends, but I hope I have shown in this paper how a powerful argument for a perfect duty lying on the state to protect its citizens from public health disaster can be constructed, and the foundations of legitimate sovereign enforcement of powers of compulsory license over intellectual property. Public health takes priority over private economic interest. The only question is whether private economic interest is the only, or indeed an, effective means for promoting the public health in conditions of disaster.

#### 2] Performativity – the reason rounds have a winner and loser is because of the judge’s sovereign power to reconcile argumentative clash. Every framework collapse because they all require argumentative evaluation that is our framework.

#### 3] Ideal Theory Good – a] Sequencing – we need an ideal world to envision to work towards so only ideal theory can guide action b] Relativity Problem – We can’t assign universal obligation since non-ideal theory commits us to understanding individual circumstances which is radically different for each person

#### Negate –

#### 1] Sequencing – a sovereign can’t be obligated to do anything because they are the ones who choose what ethics and truth – the rez tries to coerce the sovereign to do something which challenges its authority.

#### 2] IP rights are implicit in the creation of the sovereign in expressing creativity.

Ghosh 04 [Shubha Ghosh (B.A., Amherst College; Ph.D., University of Michigan; J.D., Stanford Law School; Professor of Law, University at Buffalo, SUNY, Law School; Visiting Professor, SMU Dedman School of Law). “PATENTS AND THE REGULATORY STATE: RETHINKING THE PATENT BARGAIN METAPHOR AFTER ELDRED”. BERKELEY TECHNOLOGY LAW JOURNAL. 2004. Accessed 9/3/21. <https://lawcat.berkeley.edu/record/1119327/files/fulltext.pdf> //Xu]

As illustration of the limits of social contract theory,46 particularly the malleability of the notions of consent and promise, consider a social contract theory of intellectual property based on the thoughts of Thomas Hobbes rather than that of John Locke. No scholar has expressly developed a Hobbesian theory of patent or of copyright, but as a challenge to social contract theory, it may be useful to imagine what such a theory would look like.47 For Hobbes, humans created the leviathan-the sovereign state-to protect themselves from each other in the state of nature. 48 Without the leviathan, the state of nature was not an idyllic paradise but a condition of savagery and brutality. In the state of nature, to the extent that any creative activity occurred, the objects of creation would be cannibalized, thoughtlessly copied, adapted, distributed, and performed or used, sold, offered to sell, and made by others. Thus, intellectual property law under the leviathan would protect individuals from this state of nature by making them absolute, immutable, bountiful, and unlimited. Humans would consent to these terms if they were enforced equally for all creations, and each author and inventor would promise to all others to abide by this form of the intellectual property social contract.

## 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.