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#### Counterplan Text - Resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to

#### eliminate intellectual property protections for medicines except for orphan drugs.

#### prioritize distribution of orphan drugs to the Global South.

#### Orphan drug legislation is specifically key to stimulate research into rare diseases

Horgan et. al 20 D, Moss B, Boccia S, Genuardi M, Gajewski M, Capurso G, Fenaux P, Gulbis B, Pellegrini M, Mañú Pereira M, M, Gutiérrez Valle V, Gutiérrez Ibarluzea I, Kent A, Cattaneo I, Jagielska B, Belina I, Tumiene B, Ward A, Papaluca M: Time for Change? The Why, What and How of Promoting Innovation to Tackle Rare Diseases – Is It Time to Update the EU’s Orphan Regulation? And if so, What Should be Changed? Biomed Hub 2020;5:1-11. doi: 10.1159/000509272 [https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272) //sid

The European Union’s (EU) Regulation (EC) No. 141/2000 on orphan medicinal products (OMPs) (referred to as “the regulation” in this paper) states that “patients suffering from rare conditions should be entitled to the same quality of treatment as other patients,” and concludes that “it is therefore necessary to stimulate the research, development and bringing to the market of appropriate medications by the pharmaceutical industry” [[1](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#ref1)]. Rare diseases had already been identified as a priority area for Community action within the framework for action in the field of public health [[2](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#ref2)], and the regulation’s stated aim is – “to provide incentives for the research, development and placing on the market of designated orphan medicinal products.” It set up a mechanism to ensure that “orphan medicinal products eligible for incentives should be easily and unequivocally identified,” with the condition that “objective criteria for designation should be established” [[3](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#ref3)]. The core incentive of the regulation is the granting of 10 years (+2 years for paediatric orphan medicines) of marketing exclusivity and a range of financial and scientific provisions granted via the European Medicines Agency to support product development and application for Marketing Authorisation. Nearly two decades later, the success of the measure has been demonstrated. Investment both from public research funders and from companies of all sizes in rare disease research has resulted in the approval of more than 150 orphan drugs – compared with just eight therapies for rare diseases available before the adoption of the regulation. That translates into a lot of patient benefit. With clinical research stimulated by the legislation, the EU sees some 2,000 clinical trials providing still more innovation or hope for treatments in the current R&D pipeline [[4](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#ref4)]. But over the intervening years, the limitations in the functioning of the legislation have become apparent too, and these merit attention if the beneficial effects for patients and caregivers are to be maximised [[5](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#ref5)]. This paper explores the successes and limitation of both the regulation and its implementation mechanisms in the current regulatory context, and suggests some improvements that could maximise its benefits and boost rare disease research even further. The discussion needs to be precise if it is to be effective. Review of the functioning of the regulation may coincide with a period of more intense scrutiny and concerns over containing the rise of expenditure to ensure sustainability of healthcare systems, with a particular focus on expensive innovation which are often developed within the orphan conditions. While there is undoubted importance in the wider but distinct debate over healthcare costs, it does not bear directly on reviewing the orphan medicines regulation [[6](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#ref6)]. At the same time, economic questions do, however, have relevance to the debate on orphans, since patients’ access to the medicines that become available is conditioned by the national arrangements for reimbursement or listing of products: there is an increasing tension between the potential access to agents that can modify or even cure rare diseases, and the models for reimbursement available to European payers. Part of this hesitancy can be ascribed to the novelty of the challenges presented by many innovative treatments, which by their nature present unknowns to payers. Clearly, there is also a need to deal with uncertainty with regard to value demonstration, especially when value or values are perceived not to be sufficiently demonstrated. The risk is that such powerful economic reservations can have a cumulative negative impact on the motivation for pursuing research into rare disease treatments – thus running counter to the guiding principle of the legislation itself [[7](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#ref7)]. Current value assessment rules across Europe for orphan drugs remain largely inadequate and can become a real fourth hurdle to effective patient access to those treatments [[8](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#ref8)]. The regulation’s stimulation of new product development has also helped promote the development of EU biotech companies. The last two decades have witnessed the emergence of more than 150 small and medium enterprises (SMEs) focusing on rare diseases. No wonder that one of the prominent Members of the European Parliament over this period, Francoise Grossetête, emphasised the importance of the regulation in addressing “real medical needs” and generating “therapeutic breakthroughs” [[9](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#ref9)]. The underlying strength of the concept of providing incentives for R&D in areas of unmet need is confirmed by the fact that Germany and other Member States are now exploring whether OMP-type incentives could contribute to solving the major risks of antimicrobial resistance (AMR), through promoting development of new anti-bacterials even where simple market economics do not provide sufficient motivation for investment [[10](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#ref10)]. Thanks to increased investments and the associated efforts thus made possible, some rare diseases now benefit from effective treatments. There are leading examples in the area of haemophilia, paroxysmal nocturnal haemoglobinuria (PNH), and some lysosomal storage diseases such as Gaucher. The full list of conditions for which “orphans medicines” have been launched in Europe is too extensive to reproduce here, but by way of illustration it ranges from rare cancers to rare variants of common diseases (pulmonary hypertension, neonatal diabetes) and to rare congenital, mostly childhood-onset disorders (Gaucher, cystinosis, inherited hyperammonaemias) [[11](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#ref11)]. However, these tales of success should not lead to any delusions that the process has been – or is becoming – easy. Successes in developing innovative treatments are hard-won. Without consistent and determined effort, innovation does not happen – and innovation in rare diseases is all the more challenging. The key elements of the innovation process are well documented, but the nature of the challenges is perhaps not always fully appreciated by those outside the healthcare sector, being seen as costs and not as investments. Rare diseases are categorized as “orphan diseases” because their occurrence in a small number of patients means that, despite apparent high unmet medical need, there is limited scientific understanding, making it difficult to justify the development risk and investment to develop new treatments. The OMP regulation was developed explicitly to support efforts in this field of innovation [[12](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/509272#ref12)].

#### Orphan diseases require time intensive care and affect millions.

**Lancet 19** [Lancet, 2-1-2019, accessed on 9-6-2021, The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology, "Spotlight on rare diseases", https://www.thelancet.com/journals/landia/article/PIIS2213-8587(19)30006-3/fulltext]//sid

Feb 28 is Rare Disease Day, the theme of which this year is “bridging health and social care”. This 12th annual [Rare Disease Day](https://www.rarediseaseday.org/page/news/theme-2019)highlights the need for better coordination of medical, social, and support services to lessen the burden that rare diseases—often complex, chronic, and disabling—have on the everyday lives of patients, their families, and carers. As a recent [Europe-wide survey](http://download2.eurordis.org.s3.amazonaws.com/rbv/2017_05_09_Social%20survey%20leaflet%20final.pdf)found that 80% of patients and carers had difficulty completing daily tasks, 70% found organising care time-consuming (with 60% finding it hard to manage), and 67% felt that health, social, and local services communicated poorly with each other, the theme of Rare Disease Day 2019 is timely. More than 6000 [rare diseases](https://globalgenes.org/rare-diseases-facts-statistics/) (80% with a genetic component) affect more than 300 million people worldwide. While an individual disease might be classed as rare (defined as affecting less than 1 in 2000 of the general population in the European Union or fewer than 200 000 people in the USA), the sheer number of rare diseases means that the overall numbers quickly stack up: 3·5 million people in the UK, 30 million across Europe, and 30 million in the USA are affected. Whether a single rare disease affects thousands or just one person, the impact on the affected individual and those around them can be devastating: 50% of rare diseases affect children, 30% of whom will die before age 5 years. Rare diseases present myriad challenges for patients, their families, and caregivers, including the time it takes to obtain a correct diagnosis for many patients. In a [survey](https://globalgenes.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/ShireReport-1.pdf) of patients and caregivers in the USA and UK, patients reported that it took on average 7·6 years in the USA and 5·6 years in the UK to get a proper diagnosis, during which time patients typically visited eight physicians (four primary care and four specialist) and received two to three misdiagnoses. As there is no approved treatment for 95% of rare diseases, a diagnosis can be a crushing reality check for patients and their families, rather than bringing hope and reassurance. As such, rare diseases impose a considerable emotional toll on patients and their caregivers. Other challenges include a lack of information and resources, the financial cost of care, and difficulty in accessing appropriate medical expertise, which is compounded by a lack of specialist training programmes for medical professionals. In this issue of The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology, we publish a call-to-action to address the [unmet need for subspecialty training](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(18)30369-3) in adult rare (inherited metabolic) diseases, which is crucial given that 50% of rare diseases present in adulthood and children surviving rare diseases eventually transition to adult care.

#### Rare diseases disproportionately affect people of color

**RDDC, No Date** (RDDC, No Date, accessed on 9-6-2021, Rare Disease Diversity Coalition, "Charting thePath Forwardfor Equity inRare Diseases", <https://3hqwxl1mqiah5r73r2q7zll1-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/RDDC_Path_Forward_Final.pdf>)//sid

While the rare disease community continues to face hurdles generally, people of color face additional hurdles in their quest for care . Barriers to diagnosis and treatment for people of color often have deadly consequences . Flaws across the entire system have a compounding effect on the care that Black, Native American, Hispanic, Asian, and Pacific Islander Americans with rare diseases receive . Americans of color continue to be underrepresented in genome-wide association studies and clinical research trials, leading to a lack of understanding about effective treatments, particularly in diverse populations . Despite making up more than 38 percent of the U .S . population, people of color comprise only 16 percent of research study participants .20 On the patient side, people of color are less likely to have affordable access to health care and rare disease experts .21 To make matters worse, some rare diseases disproportionately impact people of color . For instance, sarcoidosis, sickle cell anemia, thalassemia, and some forms of lupus are known to affect minority populations at higher rates than the general population .22 And implicit bias particularly harms people of color with rare diseases .23

## 2

#### The United States federal government should:

#### - substantially increase production and global distribution of the COVID-19 Vaccine, specifically providing all necessary vaccines to India, Latin America, and South Africa, and

#### - cooperate with allies to achieve increased production and global distribution of the COVID-19 Vaccine.

#### The US should take the lead – otherwise, China and Russia will use vaccine diplomacy to advance foreign policy goals. The counterplan alone solves and reinvigorates US leadership.

Gayle et al 21. [(HELENE GAYLE is President and CEO of the Chicago Community Trust and has served in global health and development roles with CARE, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. GORDON LaFORGE is a Senior Researcher at Princeton University and a lecturer at Arizona State University’s Thunderbird School of Global Management. ANNE-MARIE SLAUGHTER is CEO of New America and former Director of Policy Planning at the U.S. State Department) “America Can—and Should—Vaccinate the World,” Foreign Affairs, March 19, 2021. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-03-19/america-can-and-should-vaccinate-world>] TDI

These initiatives come not a moment too soon. In tackling the worst global crisis of a lifetime, the United States has so far been upstaged. Russia and China have aggressively marketed and distributed their vaccines to foreign countries, largely to advance foreign policy goals. Russia is using the jab to bolster its image and investment prospects and to drive a wedge between EU countries. China is donating doses to gain leverage in territorial disputes and expand its influence under the Belt and Road Initiative. Both Moscow and Beijing have moved to undercut the United States in its own backyard by supplying vaccines to Latin America**.** The Biden administration is right to want to take the lead in vaccinating the world, for a host of reasons both self-interested and altruistic. But it should not fall into the trap of trying to beat Russia and China at their own game—handing out vaccines to specific countries based on their geostrategic importance and the amount of attention they are receiving from rival powers. Rather, Biden should pursue abroad the sort of “all in” unity approach that he has proclaimed at home. His administration should focus less on strategic advantage than on vaccinating the largest number of people worldwide in the shortest amount of time. In so doing, the United States would concentrate on what the world’s peoples have in common—susceptibility to this and many other viruses—regardless of the nature of their governments. ALL IN AND ALL OUT The United States has successfully mobilized its own and international resources to respond to regional crises in the past. In 2003, President George W. Bush started the U.S. President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, the largest global health program focused on a single disease in history. PEPFAR brought together U.S. agencies, private companies, and local civil society groups to help sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia get the AIDS crisis under control, saving millions of lives. In 2004, a tsunami in the Indian Ocean caused more than 220,000 deaths and billions in damage, and the United States led an urgent, similarly inclusive humanitarian relief and recovery effort that rescued victims, hastened reconstruction, and built lasting goodwill in South and Southeast Asia. Biden can improve on Bush’s precedent by going global, and he has already taken steps toward doing so. Under President Donald Trump, the United States refused to participate in the COVID-19 Vaccine Global Access (COVAX) Facility, an international partnership that aims to guarantee COVID-19 vaccine access for the entire world. The Biden administration reversed this stance immediately and contributed $4 billion, making the United States the largest donor to the effort. Still, even if COVAX meets the ambitious target of delivering two billion doses to developing nations by the end of 2021, it will be able to vaccinate only 20 percent of those countries’ populations. Just imagine, however, what could happen if Washington were to treat COVID-19 as the equivalent of the enemy in a world war or the pandemic as a global version of the regional AIDS and Ebola epidemics of years past. Imagine, in other words, what all-out mobilization would look like if the **United States treated the COVID-19 pandemic like the global threat** that it is. The Biden administration is right to want to take the lead in vaccinating the world. Washington would lead a multilateral, whole-of-society effort to help COVAX vaccinate the world. The government would activate the military and call upon allies in the G-7 and NATO for a major assistance operation that speeds the flow of vaccine supplies and strengthens delivery systems. As it has pledged to do in the Quad summit deal, the U.S. government would use the State Department, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and other civilian agencies and development programs to help countries with their national vaccination programs. And it would enlist companies, nonprofits, and civil society organizations to help increase vaccine production, raise funding, and provide technical assistance to foreign counterparts. The U.S. government should undertake exactly such an effort, right now: an all-out response for an all-in global vaccination campaign. Such a campaign would advance U.S. economic and security interests and reboot American global leadership after years of decline. Rather than perpetuate the transactional, friend-by-friend vaccine diplomacy of China and Russia, a U.S.-led vaccine effort could invigorate a new multilateralism that is more pragmatic and inclusive than the twentieth-century international order and better adapted to tackling twenty-first-century global threats. Washington would do well to remember that if COVID-19 does come back, authoritarian governments will be able to lock down their populations more quickly and effectively than democracies will, so even in competitive terms, America’s best bet really is to eradicate the novel coronavirus. The United States has a momentous opportunity to prove both that democracy can deliver and that American ideals truly are universal. By offering a model of global cooperation that draws on a far wider range of resources than any one government can provide, the United States can lead a vaccine effort that builds on the strengths of its open and pluralist society. President Biden would demonstrate unequivocally that the United States is not only “back” but looking—and leading—far ahead.

#### Maintenance of the ILO is key to reduce a host of existential threats – establishes great-power peace.

Brands 18. [(Hal Brands is a Henry Kissinger Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies, Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. “America’s Global Order Is Worth Fighting For, Bloomberg Opinion, Politics & Policy,” August 14, 2018, Bloomberg. <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2018-08-14/america-s-global-order-is-worth-fighting-for>] TDI

The first argument is easily disposed of. Yes, the postwar world has been thoroughly imperfect, featuring nuclear arms races, genocides, widespread poverty and other scourges. But the world has always been imperfect, and by any meaningful comparison, the last seven decades have been a veritable golden age. The liberal international economic order has led to an explosion of domestic and global prosperity: According to World Bank data, both U.S. and global per capita income have increased roughly three-fold (in inflation-adjusted terms) since 1960, with U.S. gross domestic product increasing nearly six-fold. The U.S. system of alliances and forward military deployments has contributed critically to the longest period of great-power peace in modern history, and the incidence of war and conquest more broadly have dropped dramatically. The number of democracies in the world has increased from perhaps a dozen during World War II to well over 100 today; respect for basic human rights has also reached impressive levels. As a bevy of scholarship has shown, the policies that the U.S. has pursued and the international order it has built have contributed enormously and directly to these outcomes. If the liberal international order can’t be considered a smashing success, no international order could be. The second critique is also overstated. It is true that Washington, like all great powers throughout history, has been willing to bend the rules to get its way. It is hard to reconcile Cold War-era interventions in Guatemala, Chile and other countries with a professed solicitude for human rights and democracy; the Iraq War of 2003 is only one instance in which the U.S. brushed aside the concerns of international organizations such as the U.N. Security Council. Likewise, when the U.S. government determined that the Bretton Woods system of monetary relations no longer suited its interests in the 1970s, it terminated that scheme and insisted on creating a more favorable one. But again, the proper standard here is not sainthood but reality. And the U.S. has generally enlisted its power in the service of universal values such as democracy and human rights; it has, more often than not, promoted a positive-sum international system in which like-minded nations can be secure and wealthy. This goes back to the very beginning of the liberal order: Washington did not seek to hold its defeated adversaries in subjugation after World War II; it rebuilt Japan and western Germany into thriving, democratic allies that became fierce economic competitors to the U.S. The U.S. has taken this approach not simply because it wanted to do good in the world — powerful as this motivation is — but because of a hard-headed desire to do good for itself. In an interdependent global environment, American officials have long calculated, the U.S. cannot divorce its own well-being from that of the wider world. And in contrast to how other great powers — Imperial Japan, for instance, or the Soviet Union — ruled their spheres of influence, American behavior has been positively enlightened. It is this relatively benign behavior that has convinced so many countries to tolerate American leadership — and it is the emergence of a darker form of U.S. hegemony under the Trump administration that so profoundly worries them today. As for the third critique, the premise is right, but the conclusion can easily go too far. It is always dangerous to become so enraptured by past achievements that one loses sight of the need for adaptation in the future. This is particularly true today, because the strength of the liberal order is being tested from within and without, by issues ranging from unequal burden-sharing among American allies to the ambivalence of the American people themselves. There is little evidence to suggest, however, that either American power or the liberal order it supports have eroded so dramatically that Washington’s postwar project cannot be sustained. Quite the contrary — the U.S. is likely to remain the world’s strongest power for decades to come.

#### The cp comparatively solves better – IP rights don’t hinder vaccine cooperation, but manufacturing capacity is the current constraint.

Hans Sauer 6-17 [(Deputy General Counsel, Biotechnology Industry Organization.) “Web event — Confronting Joe Biden’s proposed TRIPS waiver for COVID-19 vaccines and treatments” https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/210617-Confronting-Joe-Bidens-proposed-TRIPS-waiver.pdf?x91208&x91208] TDI

But contrary to what Lori said, there are genuine real problems in the supply chain that are not caused by patents, that are simply caused by the unavailability and the constraints on existing capacity. There is in this world such a thing as maxed-out capacity that just can’t be increased on a dime. It’s not all due to intellectual property. This is true for existing vaccines as well as for vaccine raw materials. There are trade barriers. There are export restrictions that we should all be aware of and that we need to work on. And there are very real political, I think, interests in finding an explanation for how we got to this place that absolve governments around the world from their own policy decisions that they made in the past. In the United States, again, it was the declared policy of the previous administration, as well as this one, that we would vaccinate healthy college kids and go all down the line and offer a vaccine to everybody who wants it before we start sharing any with grandmothers in Burkina Faso. That was the policy. You can agree with it or disagree with it, but that was policy. We had export restrictions in place before a lot of other countries did. And that, too, contributed to unequal access of vaccines around the world. Another thing that was predictable was that politicians and governments around the world who want to be seen as proactive, on the ball, in control, for a long time were actually very indecisive, very unsure about how to address the COVID problem, which has so many dimensions. Vaccines are only one of those. But with respect to vaccines, not many governments took decisive action, put money on the table, put bets on multiple horses, before we knew whether these vaccines would work, would be approved. And it was governments in middle-income countries who now, I think, justifiably are concerned that they’re not getting fast enough access, who didn’t have the means and who didn’t have the decision-making structure to place the same bets on multiple horses, if you will, that were placed in the relatively more wealthy, global North and global West. But there is, I think, a really good and, with hindsight, predictable explanation of how we got to this place, and I think it teaches us something about how to fix the problem going forward. So why will the waiver not work? Well, first of all, with complex technology like vaccines, Lori touched on it, reverse engineering, like you would for a small molecule drug, is much more difficult if not impossible. But it depends very much more than small molecule drugs on cooperation, on voluntary transfer of technology, and on mutual assistance. We have seen as part of the pandemic response an unprecedented level of collaborations and cooperation and no indication that IP has stood in the way of the pandemic response. The waiver proponents have found zero credible examples of where IP has actually been an obstacle**,** where somebody has tried to block somebody else from developing a COVID vaccine or other COVID countermeasure, right? It’s not there. Second, the myth of this vast global capacity to manufacture COVID vaccines that somehow exists out there is unsubstantiated and frankly, in my opinion, untrue. But there is no such thing as vast untapped, idle capacity that could be turned around on a dime to start making COVID vaccines within weeks or even months. This capacity needs to be built; it needs to be established. And at a time when time is of the essence to beat this pandemic, starting capacity-building discussions is helpful, but it won’t be the answer to beat this pandemic. It will be the answer if we do everything right to beating the next pandemic. And if we learn any lesson of this, and then I will stop, is that the COVID waiver as well as the situation in which we find ourselves — if anything, it’s a reminder that we definitely have to take global capacity-building more seriously than we did in the past. That is true for the global North, as well as for middle-income countries — all of whom have to dedicate themselves much more determinedly to pandemic preparedness. And there’s a need to invest both in preparedness and in public health systems that hasn’t happened in the wake of past pandemic threats. This is what we will need to do. We will need to reduce export restrictions, and we will need to rededicate ourselves to preparing for the next pandemic. As far as this pandemic goes, there are 11 vaccines around the world that are already being shot into arms, only four of which come from the global North. How many more vaccines do we want? I don’t know, maybe 11 is enough if we start making more of them. But there are manufacturers around the world who know how to do this — including in China, including in India, and including in Russia. All developed their homegrown vaccines, apparently without interference by IP rights, right? So let’s make more of those. I think that’s going to be the more practical and realistic answer to solving the problem. And we need to lean on governments to stop export controls and to dedicate themselves to more global equity.

## 3

#### Biotech is the new frontier; America is ahead but China is dangerously close

Gupta 6/11 [Gaurav Gupta, Biotech Investor, Founder of Ascendant BioCapital, a life science investment firm based in New York. Previously, Gaurav worked at OrbiMed Advisors, and served as a resident in neurological surgery at Columbia University Medical Center. He has co-authored over a dozen articles in peer-reviewed journals, filed a patent on a device for use in spine surgery, and edited a book on the technical and ethical implications of using tissue engineered products in the operating room. Dr. Gupta obtained his M.D. from the Stanford University School of Medicine, where he was a Paul and Daisy Soros Fellow, and B.S. and M.S.E. in biomedical engineering from Johns Hopkins University, where he was a Charles R. Westgate Scholar.) “As Washington Ties Pharma’s Hands, China Is Leaping Ahead” Barron’s Magazine: Commentary, China., 6/11/2021] RM

There should be no doubt that we are living at the dawn of a golden age of biomedical innovation. The American scientific engine that produced Covid-19 vaccines in record time was fueled by a convergence of advances in genomics, biomarkers, data science, and manufacturing years in the making. The first Food and Drug Administration approvals of a host of new product formats—oligonucleotide, bispecific, oncolytic virus, CAR-T, and lentivirus/AAV—all took place within the last decade. These represent an unprecedented expansion of the armamentarium that physicians have at their disposal to treat and cure disease. In the last few years, [47% of all new medicines](https://www.efpia.eu/media/554521/efpia_pharmafigures_2020_web.pdf) were invented by U.S. biopharma companies, with [homegrown startups](https://www.cbo.gov/publication/57126) driving the majority of innovation. The bulk of the remainder were developed by foreign companies specifically for the U.S. market.

An indirect benefit of these trends is that most novel therapeutics undergo clinical development and early commercial launch here in the U.S. The rest of the world understands that the American patient has earlier and broader access to groundbreaking therapies via these mechanisms. Indeed, the past decade is filled with examples of medical “firsts” for American patients: the first cure for Hepatitis C, the first gene therapy for blindness, the first immunotherapy for cancer. Future rewards will be greater still if we preserve our current system of incentivizing and protecting innovation.

The remarkable innovation capacity of our biopharmaceutical industry ought to be a source of national pride. Yet while “Made in America” is the global standard for medicines in development today, misguided policy risks ceding our scientific prowess to other countries in the future. This is particularly true in the case of China, where biotechnology has become a strategic pillar for the health of its people and economy.

From 2016 to 2020, the market capitalization of all Chinese biopharma companies increased exponentially from [$1 billion to over $200 billion](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-03-01/xi-mobilizes-china-for-tech-revolution-to-cut-dependence-on-west). China saw over [$28 billion](https://www.bioworld.com/articles/506978-china-sees-five-year-highs-in-life-sciences-investments-and-partnering) invested in its life sciences sector in 2020, double the previous year’s amount. Returns on China’s investment are already arriving. The FDA approved a drug developed in China for the first time ever in 2019. While China’s innovation capacity currently remains behind America’s, my experiences as a biopharma professional make it clear they are doing everything they can to catch up and catch up fast.

In fact, when I speak to Chinese biotechnology executives, they boast that they can run clinical trials faster than their U.S. counterparts. The danger of misguided policies that disincentivize pharmaceutical innovation in the U.S. is effectively driving that same innovation to China. If we close off the market in the U.S. at the same time that China is opening its market to innovative new products, then we will see companies choose to first launch impactful novel medicines in China, based on clinical trials conducted in China. Because the FDA rarely accepts data generated entirely outside the U.S., this relocation of research capacity will negatively affect Americans’ access to cutting-edge therapies.

The biotechnology field is advancing rapidly. Promising technologies such as targeted protein degradation and gene editing are perhaps not far from being developed into impactful medicines, and the U.S. risks these technologies being mastered by Chinese companies.

It is widely held that allowing China to gain an asymmetric edge in critical technologies such as AI or quantum computing could destabilize the geopolitical balance of power. The same is true of biotechnology. Chinese scientists were the first to edit the genomes of human embryos, in [contravention](https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2019/12/chinese-scientist-who-produced-genetically-altered-babies-sentenced-3-years-jail) of international standards, and the U.S. national security community believes China is [pushing ahead](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/national-security/china-has-done-human-testing-create-biologically-enhanced-super-soldiers-n1249914) with experimental concepts for biological and cognitive enhancement of soldiers and civilians. American policy should be focused on protecting, rather than undermining, the global dominance of our biotechnology industry.

#### The plan recapitulates IP to China, destroying competitive advantages

WSJ 5/6 [Wall Street Journal Editorial Board, WSJ Opinion Philosophy: “We speak for free markets and free people, the principles, if you will, marked in the watershed year of 1776 by Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence and Adam Smith's “Wealth of Nations.” So over the past century and into the next, the Journal stands for free trade and sound money; against confiscatory taxation and the ukases of kings and other collectivists; and for individual autonomy against dictators, bullies and even the tempers of momentary majorities.” Edited by Paul A. Gigot and Daniel Henninger, “Biden’s Vaccine IP Debacle: His patent heist is a blow to the Covid fight and U.S. biotech.” The WSJ Opinion: Review and Outlook, May 6, 2021] RM

We’ve already criticized President Biden’s bewildering decision Wednesday to endorse a patent waiver for Covid vaccines and therapies. But upon more reflection this may be the single worst presidential economic decision since Nixon’s wage-and-price controls.

In one fell swoop he has destroyed tens of billions of dollars in U.S. intellectual property, set a destructive precedent that will reduce pharmaceutical investment, and surrendered America’s advantage in biotech, a key growth industry of the future. Handed an American triumph of innovation and a great soft-power opportunity, Mr. Biden throws it all away.

\*\*\*

India and South Africa have been pushing to suspend patents at the World Trade Organization for months. They claim that waiving IP protections for Covid vaccines and therapies is necessary to expand global access, but their motivation is patently self-interested.

Both are large producers of generic drugs, though they have less expertise and capacity to make complex biologics like mRNA vaccines. They want to force Western pharmaceutical companies to hand over IP free of charge so they can produce and export vaccines and therapies for profit. Their strategy has been to shame Western leaders into surrendering with the help of Democrats in the U.S.

But suspending IP isn’t necessary to expand supply and will impede safe vaccine production. The global vaccine supply is already increasing rapidly thanks to licensing agreements the vaccine makers have made with manufacturers around the world.

Pfizer and BioNTech this week said they aimed to deliver three billion doses this year, up from last summer’s 1.2 billion estimate. Moderna increased its supply forecast for this year to between 800 million and a billion from 600 million. AstraZeneca says it has built a supply network with 25 manufacturing organizations in 15 countries to produce three billion doses this year.

AstraZeneca and Novavax have leaned heavily on manufacturers in India to produce billions of doses reserved for lower-income countries. But India has restricted vaccine exports to supply its own population. IP simply isn’t restraining vaccine production.

Busting patents also won’t speed up production, since it would take months for these countries to set up new facilities. Competition will increase for scarce ingredients, and less efficient manufacturers with little expertise would make it harder for licensed partners to produce vaccines.

There’s also the problem of safety. Johnson & Johnson has experienced quality problems at an Emergent plant making its vaccines, and that’s in Baltimore. Imagine the potential problems with unlicensed producers in, say, Malaysia or Brazil. If vaccines made there have complications, confidence in licensed vaccines could plummet too. And who would Pfizer and Moderna sue to get their reputations back?

The economic self-damage is also hard to fathom. The U.S. currently has a competitive advantage in biotech and biologics manufacturing, which could be a growing export industry. Waiving IP protections for Covid vaccines and medicines will give away America’s crown pharmaceutical jewels and make the U.S. and world more reliant on India and China for pharmaceuticals.

Moderna has been working on mRNA vaccines for a decade. Covid represents its first success. Ditto for Novavax, which has been at it for three decades. Small biotech companies in the U.S. have been studying how to create vaccines using nasal sprays, pills and patches.

Thanks to Mr. Biden, all this could become the property of foreign governments. Licensing agreements allow developers to share their IP while maintaining quality control. Breaking patents and forcing tech transfers will enable China and low-income countries to manufacture U.S. biotech products on their own.

China’s current crop of vaccines are far less effective than those in the West, but soon Beijing might be able to purvey Pfizer knock-offs. The U.S. has spent years deploring China’s theft of American IP, and now the Biden Administration may voluntarily let China could reap profits from decades of American innovation.

\*\*\*

Instead of handing over American IP to the world, Mr. Biden could negotiate bilateral vaccine agreements and export excess U.S. supply. If Mr. Biden wants to increase global supply safely, the U.S. could spend more to help the companies produce more for export. Then the jobs would go to Americans. We thought this was the point of the production deal Mr. Biden negotiated between J&J and Merck.

Alas, this President seems to be paying more attention these days to Elizabeth Warren, Bernie Sanders, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Nancy Pelosi. They think vaccines and new drugs can be conjured by government as a public good with no incentive for risk-taking or profit. This really is destructive socialism.

Mr. Biden ought to listen to Angela Merkel. Pfizer’s partner BioNTech is a German firm, and the German Chancellor said Thursday that she opposes the WTO heist: “The protection of intellectual property is a source of innovation and it must remain so in the future.”

At least IP is safe in Germany. Mr. Biden has sent a signal around the world that nobody’s intellectual property is safe in America.

#### China biotech heg causes a laundry list of impacts

Moore 19 Scott Moore - Director of the Penn Global China Program at the University of Pennsylvania, Young Professional and Water Resources Management Specialist at the World Bank Group, and Environment, Science, Technology, and Health Officer for China at the U.S. Department of State, Giorgio Ruffolo Post-Doctoral Research Fellow with the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University, Truman, Fulbright, and Rhodes Scholar., Foreign Policy, "China's Genetic Experiments Are Pushing Ethical Limits", NOVEMBER 8, 2019, 2:53 PM, https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/11/08/cloning-crispr-he-jiankui-china-biotech-boom-could-transform-lives-destroy-them/ - BD

When James Clapper, the U.S. director of national intelligence at the time, appeared before Congress in early January 2016 for an annual briefing of threats to the United States, he didn’t lack for material. Just a few weeks earlier, North Korea had tested a nuclear device, and Russia had begun deploying cruise missiles that appeared to violate a crucial arms-control agreement. But to the surprise of many experts, Clapper devoted a good chunk of his time to describing a much more exotic threat: biomedical research. Specifically, Clapper warned, “Research in genome editing conducted by countries with different regulatory or ethical standards than those of Western countries probably increases the risk of the creation of potentially harmful biological agents or products.”

Clapper’s statement didn’t explicitly mention China—but it didn’t need to. As his testimony went on to make clear, while in the 20th century the United States and Soviet Union held the keys to preventing planetary catastrophe, in the 21st the principal players are the United States and China. And while in a previous age keeping Pandora’s box closed meant preventing nuclear war, today it’s about preventing biotech dangers.

In just the past few years, the development of inexpensive gene-editing techniques has democratized biomedical research, producing a biotech bonanza in places such as China and creating a whole new category of security threats in the process, from the use of genetic information to persecute dissidents and minority groups to the development of sophisticated bioweapons.

When it comes to the United States, China, and technology, artificial intelligence tends to grab most of the attention. But policymakers need to come to grips with the even bigger threat of biotechnology—and soon. Fortunately, though, shared concerns about China’s role in biotechnology also provide a rare chance for meaningful and productive engagement in shaping the rules of a new world.

China’s starring role in preventing the 21st century’s biotech perils stems from its skyrocketing investment in biomedical research. Historically, Western countries, and especially the United States, have been the epicenter of research in the life sciences. The United States alone accounted for some 45 percent of biotech and medical patents filed in the 14-year period ending in 2013. But now, thanks to heavy state-backed investment, China is catching up. Economic plans instituted in 2015 call for the biotechnology sector to account for more than 4 percent of China’s total GDP by 2020, and estimates suggest that as of 2018, central, provincial, and local governments had already invested over $100 billion in the life sciences. Chinese venture capital and private equity investment in the life sciences, meanwhile, totaled some $45 billion just from 2015 to 2017.

China has also invested considerable effort in competing with countries like the United States for biotech talent. Of some 7,000 researchers recruited under the Thousand Talents Plan since 2008, more than 1,400 specialized in the life sciences. A leading American geneticist, Harris Lewin, has warned that the United States is “starting to fall behind … the Chinese, who have always been good collaborators, [are] now taking the lead.”

For the United States and other Western countries, China’s growing role in biomedical research is raising plenty of concern. Several Chinese researchers have shown a willingness to ignore ethical and regulatory constraints on genetic research. In 2018, He Jiankui became a poster child for scientific irresponsibility when he announced he had edited the genes of two twins in utero without following basic safety protocols. He reportedly dismissed them as guidelines, not laws.

Yet the reaction at home was not what He had hoped for. His research had been made possible by the relatively lax standards of Chinese universities, even as he had kept the true nature of it secret from many involved – while discussing it with a small group of Western bioethicists and scientists, who stressed their disapproval. It’s not uncommon in China to break the rules and be lauded for the results anyway, whatever the field. For He, though, the vast international attention that came after the story broke cost him his career and possibly his freedom. Chinese media rushed to stress official disapproval of the experiments. Even the overt purpose of the editing – to ensure that the babies, born to HIV+ mothers, enjoyed protection against the virus – turned out to be scientifically weak.

As China’s biotech sector grows, so too do fears that Chinese researchers like He will be more willing to push the limits of both science and ethics than those in the United States. Earlier this year, Chinese researchers recorded another mind-bending milestone when they implanted human genes linked to intelligence into monkey embryos—and then said that the monkeys performed better on memory tests.

The dominance of the party-state in China raises serious concerns around biotechnology, especially because it carries increasingly ethnonationalist tone. When in 2018 Chinese researchers created the world’s first primate clones, for example, they dubbed them Zhong Zhong and Hua Hua, from the term zhonghua meaning “The Chinese Nation”—an oddly jingoistic moniker for a pair of monkeys. Chinese government policies often blur the line between eugenics and education, lumped together as improving the “quality” (suzhi) of the population, which received another stamp of official endorsement following the recent Fourth Plenum. These programs are carried out through the country’s huge so-called family planning bureaucracy—originally established to enforce the one-child policy.

Moreover, Beijing is increasingly extending its formidable social control apparatus into the realm of genetics. While there are considerable restrictions on private firms sharing biomedical data, largely because of an ugly history of popular discrimination against hepatitis carriers, the government has no such restrictions. A New York Times report earlier this year suggested, for example, that Chinese authorities had assembled a vast trove of genetic data on Chinese citizens without their consent, with the Uighur minority group having been specifically targeted.

Beijing’s brand of bio-nationalism also directly threatens the United States. U.S. officials have been warning universities and research institutions that the biotech sector is a focal point for Chinese industrial espionage activities in the United States. And this past August, a senior Defense Department official warned Congress that China’s growing role in pharmaceutical manufacturing could allow it to disrupt deliveries of critical battlefield medicines, or potentially even alter them to harm U.S. forces

Yet the biggest risks posed by biotech, for China, the United States, and other countries, pertain to nonstate actors. A critical feature of modern biotech, in contrast to technology like nuclear weapons, is that it’s cheap and easy to develop. A technique known as CRISPR, which the Chinese researcher He used in his illicit gene-editing work, makes it practical for just about anyone to manipulate the genomes of just about any organism they can lay their hands on. CRISPR makes it much simpler to skirt ethical restrictions and terrifyingly straightforward for terrorist groups to develop fearsome biological weapons.

Researchers have already shown it’s possible to reconstruct the smallpox virus, which was eradicated in the real world in the 1970s, for as little as $200,000 using DNA fragments you can order online. If a terrorist or rogue state were to successfully do so, virtually no one alive would have any resistance to the virus—and most stockpiles of the vaccine were destroyed long ago. There is an organization, the International Gene Synthesis Consortium, that tries to screen suspicious orders for DNA fragments that might be used to build such bioweapons. And while most of the world’s major DNA synthesis firms belong to the consortium, membership is completely voluntary, and there’s also a thriving and entirely unregulated black market—much of it based in China.

All of this means that biosecurity standards in places like China matter more than ever. After all, if a major bioweapon were to be unleashed, it’s unlikely that any major, globally integrated country could escape unharmed. Fortunately, there are growing signs China is open to better regulation of its biotech sector. In February, the Chinese government announced that “high risk” biomedical research would be overseen by the State Council, China’s equivalent of the cabinet—a sign of the concern with which Beijing views incidents like the He Jiankui CRISPR scandal. In a further sign of this concern, in August, the Chinese Communist Party announced the creation of a new committee to advise top leaders on research ethics.

Government worry is matched by growing public concern within China. Opposition to genetically modified organisms is arguably stronger in China than in the West, and health concerns top the list of public issues. Rumors and panics largely center around health issues, especially after a series of vaccination scandals. That means that the government has to walk unusually carefully and offers plenty of scope to build ethical concerns into both law and practice.

There are plenty of issues for U.S.-China cooperation on biotechnology and biosecurity to address. Given China’s role in the He Jiankui scandal, meanwhile, it would make sense to partner with the United States and other countries as part of a new World Health Organization effort to set international guidelines for the use of CRISPR. Another promising area of U.S.-China cooperation, especially in the research community, relates to so-called gene drives, the process of editing genomes and then spreading them through an entire population in just a few generations. Using gene drives to prevent select mosquito species from reproducing, for example, might finally banish the world of debilitating, widespread diseases such as malaria and Zika, while endangered species might be engineered to survive climate change.

Microsoft founder Bill Gates once observed that “The world hasn’t had that many technologies that are both promising and dangerous. … We had nuclear weapons and nuclear energy.” But thanks in large part to the efforts of biomedical researchers in the United States and China, biotechnology is opening a similar Pandora’s box. And while the world has so far avoided nuclear war or conflict, it’s done so largely though efforts by governments, aided by the fact that nuclear technology is extremely difficult and expensive to master.

The new wave of synthetic biology is exactly the opposite: It’s cheap to use and employ. For that very reason, while the U.S., Chinese, and other governments will be critical to dealing with the threat of new technologies, the discussions can’t be limited to nation-states. They’ll also have to gather together individual researchers, institutions, companies, and organizations like the International Gene Synthesis Consortium. When it comes to the risks posed by emerging technologies, Beijing, like Washington, will have to face the limits of its ability to solve the problem on its own.

#### China will leapfrog the US through biotech primacy

Cumbers 20 [John Cumbers, “I am the founder and CEO of SynBioBeta, the leading community of innovators, investors, engineers, and thinkers who share a passion for using synthetic biology to build a better, more sustainable universe. I publish the weekly SynBioBeta Digest, host the SynBioBeta Podcast, and wrote “What’s Your Biostrategy?”, the first book to anticipate how synthetic biology is going to disrupt virtually every industry in the world. I also founded BetaSpace, a space settlement innovation network and community of visionaries, technologists, and investors accelerating the industries needed to sustain human life here and off-planet. I’ve been involved with multiple startups, I am an operating partner and investor at the hard tech investment fund Data Collective, and I'm a former bioengineer at NASA. I earned my PhD in Molecular Biology, Cell Biology, and Biochemistry from Brown University and am originally from the UK.”) “China’s Plan To Beat The U.S. In The Trillion-Dollar Global Bioeconomy” Forbes, 2/3/2020] RM

The report, entitled “Safeguarding the Bioeconomy,” looks at how research and innovation in the life sciences is driving rapid growth in agriculture, biomedical science, information science and computing, energy, and other sectors of the U.S. economy. This economic activity—collectively referred to as the bioeconomy—presents many opportunities to create jobs, improve the quality of life, and continue to drive the U.S. economy as a whole.

The report says that while the U.S. has been a leader in advancements in the biological sciences, other countries are actively investing in and expanding their capabilities in this area—and the U.S.’s lead is beginning to slip.

Four reasons everyone should care about the U.S. bioeconomy

It might be easy for some to dismiss the report out of hand as a bunch of alarmist professors lobbying for more research money. But when you consider all the ways that biotechnology powers the economy and impacts our daily lives, it becomes clear that this is about something more:

The economy: at $1 trillion in value, the U.S. bioeconomy represents hundreds of thousands of quality, high-paying jobs for Americans.

Health & medicine: innovators in the bioeconomy are making next-generation therapies for cancer and diabetes, tackling emerging diseases like Coronavirus, and even increasing human longevity.

Food & farming: biotechnology is not only making agriculture more sustainable, it’s also bringing to market new and improved crops that are more nutritious, more affordable, and more delicious.

The environment: humanity’s health and well-being depend on our ability to stop and reverse climate change, and we can’t do it without biological solutions that treat carbon not as a waste product, but as the starting point for chemicals and materials that today use petroleum.

Considering all this, it doesn’t seem like an overstatement when the report authors say that U.S. competitiveness in the bioeconomy is key to maintaining the economic health and security of the country.

The very real risks to the U.S. bioeconomy

There are many things that can go wrong, causing the U.S. to lose its current edge in the global bioeconomy. Some of these are economic risks, and others present serious national security risks. All of them are related to a failure of our government to act now. Here’s a sampling of the risks to U.S. leadership at the frontiers of tech and bio:

Insufficient government R&D investment. Money for basic research and development builds the foundations of the bioeconomy. We learn, achieve new results, and create new applications. Investments that help develop enabling tools, technologies, and standards have the potential to maintain the U.S. bioeconomy competitive in a global bioeconomy.

Ineffective or inefficient regulations. Regulatory uncertainty stifles creative new approaches that may have unknown paths, long delays, or that might be prohibited by later changes.

Inadequate workforce. The U.S.’s K-12 education system may not prepare students to study STEM subjects at the university and postgraduate level, hindering the quality of workers. A skilled workforce gives U.S. companies the best talent to choose from, and it also encourages international firms to establish research and production facilities here.

Ineffective or inefficient intellectual property protections. Uncertainty over what is patentable could discourage innovators who are considering whether and how to bring their innovations to market. Patent eligibility is also important to venture capitalists and private equity investors when considering whether to invest in biotechnology companies.

Cybersecurity. As biological engineering depends more and more on massive datasets, the emerging bioeconomy now exists at the intersection of information science and biotechnological science. The bioeconomy’s growing reliance on software, networking, and computer hardware tools yields the same cyber vulnerabilities present in any other sector, including hacking, sabotage, breached privacy, or theft of intellectual property.

Biosafety and biosecurity risks. The tools of today’s bioeconomy are enabling new capabilities that can generate concerns regarding traditional biothreats. These can include the accidental or intentional creation or release of dangerous or lethal pathogens. Such biothreats can harm humans, animals, plants, agriculture, the environment, and materials.

Risks from climate change. Food and feed crops, biofuels crops, and crops used with bio-based fermentation products are susceptible to temperature and water stresses, as well as insects and pathogens that migrate with changing weather patterns.

China: the biotech elephant in the room

I’ve written previously written how the Chinese government is already making substantial investments in its bioeconomy. Here are three scary statistics, courtesy of Greg B. Scott of the ChinaBio Group:

China is out-investing the U.S. China’s private investors poured $14.4 billion into its bioeconomy in 2019. That compares to the United States’ more meager investment of $10.4 billion.

China is building a bigger bioeconomy workforce. China graduates about 8-10 million students each year. In the U.S., that number is closer to 400,000. Many Chinese students graduating from U.S. institutions stay here, but they are increasingly returning home to start highly innovative companies.

China is investing in itself. Historically, China has invested heavily in foreign companies, tech, and debt. Now we’re seeing an uptick in China-to-China investments—the country no longer needs to look abroad to find plenty of good biotech opportunities.

Chinese investments have led to centers of excellence in the regional technology hub of Shenzhen, including the Institute of Synthetic Biology at the Shenzhen Institute of Advanced Sciences (SIAT) and BGI Genomics. Shenzhen will compete for technological and economic leadership with U.S. regional biotech powerhouses such as San Francisco/Silicon Valley and Boston/Cambridge in the years to come.

Many of China’s long-standing challenges—environment, food, water, waste management, and rapid innovation to retain its global manufacturing competitiveness—are areas where synthetic biology is seen as a key technology for the future. In other words, synthetic biology is not just an academic pursuit for China. Rather, its leaders are thinking proactively about how biological engineering can be used to address the country’s strategic national interests—while U.S. leadership stands idly by.

What do we do?

So what can U.S. policymakers do to protect the U.S. bioeconomy and ensure continued technological and economic leadership in biology for the next twenty years?

Straight from the top. China has made clear its ambition to become a global tech superpower, with President Xi Jinping calling science and technology one of the main battlefronts of the economy. The U.S. administration needs to step up its game, too. President Trump recently declared January 2020 to be National Biotechnology Month, citing “boundless possibilities for economic growth, national security, healthcare, manufacturing, and agriculture.” That’s the right sentiment—now we need real action.

New legislation. Late last year, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Engineering Biology Research and Development Act of 2019, which would direct the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to implement a national research strategy for engineering biology. The explicit goal: maintain U.S. science, technology, and economic leadership in synthetic biology. The bill now resides in the Senate and awaits committee action. Legislative leadership is now needed to give this bill the appropriations necessary to give it real teeth, and then put it squarely on the President’s desk.

Investing for returns. The Human Genome Project is said to have returned $141 for every dollar invested by taxpayers. While “Big Science” yields tremendous benefits for everyone, it doesn’t happen without federal funding. In 2019, politically courageous Republicans and Democrats came together to produce a 2020 final spending bill that is kind to science, in essence ignoring President Trump’s proposed cuts and instead giving increases to each of the NIH, NSF, NASA, and DOE’s Office of Science. But the U.S. isn’t even in the top ten for R&D spending as a percentage of GDP, while China continues to close in on the U.S., meaning that the U.S. is no longer the uncontested global leader in science.

Leading the global bioeconomy: Have some courage

There are many things the U.S. could do to protect the American bioeconomy. But above all else, policymakers need to come together and demonstrate the kind of courage and vision needed to be a world leader. Science and technology know no partisan lines. Everybody wants healthy lives, clean water, and good jobs. Federal initiative and assistance are needed to bring these benefits to everyone living in the U.S..

Today, the American synthetic biology industry may be unprepared for the global competition it will face, lacking initiative and leadership at the highest levels of government. But this could change quickly. If a country like the U.S. makes engineering biology a national priority, anything is possible in the new bioeconomy.

#### Heg solves arms races, land grabs, rogue states, and great power war

Brands 18 [Hal, Henry Kissinger Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies and a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments." American Grand Strategy in the Age of Trump." Page 129-133]

Since World War II, the United States has had a military second to none. Since the Cold War, America has committed to having overwhelming military primacy. The idea, as George W. Bush declared in 2002, that America must possess “strengths beyond challenge” has featured in every major U.S. strategy document for a quarter century; it has also been reflected in concrete terms.6

From the early 1990s, for example, the United States consistently accounted for around 35 to 45 percent of world defense spending and maintained peerless global power-projection capabilities.7 Perhaps more important, U.S. primacy was also unrivaled in key overseas strategic regions—Europe, East Asia, the Middle East. From thrashing Saddam Hussein’s million-man Iraqi military during Operation Desert Storm, to deploying—with impunity—two carrier strike groups off Taiwan during the China-Taiwan crisis of 1995– 96, Washington has been able to project military power superior to anything a regional rival could employ even on its own geopolitical doorstep.

This military dominance has constituted the hard-power backbone of an ambitious global strategy. After the Cold War, U.S. policymakers committed to averting a return to the unstable multipolarity of earlier eras, and to perpetuating the more favorable unipolar order. They committed to building on the successes of the postwar era by further advancing liberal political values and an open international economy, and to suppressing international scourges such as rogue states, nuclear proliferation, and catastrophic terrorism. And because they recognized that military force remained the ultima ratio regum, they understood the centrality of military preponderance.

Washington would need the military power necessary to underwrite worldwide alliance commitments. It would have to preserve substantial overmatch versus any potential great-power rival. It must be able to answer the sharpest challenges to the international system, such as Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990 or jihadist extremism after 9/11. Finally, because prevailing global norms generally reflect hard-power realities, America would need the superiority to assure that its own values remained ascendant. It was impolitic to say that U.S. strategy and the international order required “strengths beyond challenge,” but it was not at all inaccurate.

American primacy, moreover, was eminently affordable. At the height of the Cold War, the United States spent over 12 percent of GDP on defense. Since the mid-1990s, the number has usually been between 3 and 4 percent.8 In a historically favorable international environment, Washington could enjoy primacy—and its geopolitical fruits—on the cheap.

Yet U.S. strategy also heeded, at least until recently, the fact that there was a limit to how cheaply that primacy could be had. The American military did shrink significantly during the 1990s, but U.S. officials understood that if Washington cut back too far, its primacy would erode to a point where it ceased to deliver its geopolitical benefits. Alliances would lose credibility; the stability of key regions would be eroded; rivals would be emboldened; international crises would go unaddressed. American primacy was thus like a reasonably priced insurance policy. It required nontrivial expenditures, but protected against far costlier outcomes.9 Washington paid its insurance premiums for two decades after the Cold War. But more recently American primacy and strategic solvency have been imperiled.

THE DARKENING HORIZON For most of the post–Cold War era, the international system was— by historical standards—remarkably benign. Dangers existed, and as the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, demonstrated, they could manifest with horrific effect. But for two decades after the Soviet collapse, the world was characterized by remarkably low levels of great-power competition, high levels of security in key theaters such as Europe and East Asia, and the comparative weakness of those “rogue” actors—Iran, Iraq, North Korea, al-Qaeda—who most aggressively challenged American power. During the 1990s, some observers even spoke of a “strategic pause,” the idea being that the end of the Cold War had afforded the United States a respite from normal levels of geopolitical danger and competition. Now, however, the strategic horizon is darkening, due to four factors.

First, great-power military competition is back. The world’s two leading authoritarian powers—China and Russia—are seeking regional hegemony, contesting global norms such as nonaggression and freedom of navigation, and developing the military punch to underwrite these ambitions. Notwithstanding severe economic and demographic problems, Russia has conducted a major military modernization emphasizing nuclear weapons, high-end conventional capabilities, and rapid-deployment and special operations forces— and utilized many of these capabilities in conflicts in Ukraine and Syria.10 China, meanwhile, has carried out a buildup of historic proportions, with constant-dollar defense outlays rising from US$26 billion in 1995 to US$226 billion in 2016.11 Ominously, these expenditures have funded development of power-projection and antiaccess/area denial (A2/AD) tools necessary to threaten China’s neighbors and complicate U.S. intervention on their behalf. Washington has grown accustomed to having a generational military lead; Russian and Chinese modernization efforts are now creating a far more competitive
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#### Infrastructure is making halting progress via reconciliation – bipartisanship is key for Manchin and Republicans to not nuke it

Litvan 9/2 [Laura] “Manchin Jolts Democrats by Urging ‘Pause’ on $3.5 Trillion Bill,” Bloomberg, September 2, 2021, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-09-02/manchin-tells-democrats-to-pause-on-biden-s-3-5-trillion-plan>

Senator Joe Manchin is demanding a “strategic pause” in action on President Joe Biden’s economic agenda, potentially imperiling the $3.5 trillion tax and spending package that Democratic leaders plan to push through Congress this fall.

The West Virginia Democrat, a linchpin vote in the evenly divided Senate, said at an event in his home state on Wednesday and in a Thursday Wall Street Journal op-ed that rising inflation and a soaring national debt necessitate a go-slow approach and a “significantly” smaller plan than the one Democratic leaders and the White House have endorsed.

“By placing a strategic pause on this budgetary proposal, by significantly reducing the size of any possible reconciliation bill to only what America can afford and needs to spend, we can and will build a better and stronger nation for all our families,” Manchin said in the op-ed.

Manchin’s resistance to the core of Biden’s economic plan caps a politically painful month for a White House that has grappled with a chaotic withdrawal from Afghanistan, a resurgent pandemic and a massive hurricane that cut a path of death and damage from Louisiana to New York.

In comments Wednesday at an event hosted by the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce, the moderate Democrat said his party should “hit the pause button.” Lawmakers, he said, have too many other pressing issues before them, including heightening national security concerns after the Taliban takeover of Afghanistan.

“Let’s sit back. Let’s see what happens. We have so much on our plate,” he said.

Manchin’s comments come as Democratic leaders and committee chairs in the Senate and House work out the specifics of the economic package, with a goal of moving it through Congress soon after lawmakers return from a recess later this month. All members of the Senate Democratic caucus would have to back the measure for it to get the 51 votes needed to pass, with Vice President Kamala Harris providing the tie-breaking vote.

A spokesman for Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer didn’t immediately respond to a request for comment about Manchin’s request, and White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki did not immediately provide a comment.

The chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Representative Pramila Jayapal, replied “Absolutely not” on Twitter to Manchin’s idea of a pause.

The spending package also is facing obstacles in the House. Democrats can only afford three defections in that chamber if Republicans are united in opposition, and some moderate Democrats also are balking at the size of the package being drawn up.

Manchin also called on the House to pass within a few weeks a Senate-passed $550 billion bipartisan infrastructure bill. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi has promised progressives in the chamber that she will marry that legislation with the much bigger Democrat-only tax-and-spending package, although moderates have been promised an infrastructure vote by late September.

#### General bipartisanship could spark compromise but the plan’s partisan nature tanks any shot

Montanari 21 “Biden’s Undermining Of U.S. Intellectual Property Rights Is Dangerous And Will Hurt Pandemic Response,” Lorenzo Montanari [executive director of Property Rights Alliance, an advocacy policy group in charge of publishing the International Property Rights Index], May 12, 2021 <https://www.forbes.com/sites/lorenzomontanari/2021/05/12/bidens-undermining-of-us-intellectual-property-rights-is-dangerous-and-will-hurt-pandemic-response/?sh=4a74c5004890>

Republican Congressman Byron Donalds (R-Fla.) is working on a new piece of legislation titled "Preventing Foreign Attempts to Erode Healthcare Innovation Act” to block the White House IP waiver position and to "prevent the Biden Administration from senselessly giving away America's intellectual property to countries like China”. IP rights are enshrined in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8 of the U.S. Constitution of 1787, “To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.” As a central pillar to American history and constitutionalism for 244 years, IP converges tradition and progress to enrich the lives of citizens and society.

Waiving IP rights not only goes directly against America’s core values and threatens public health but wanes potential for bipartisan efforts. “Congress has spent decades wrangling over the contours of patent protections,” WSJ’s Kimberley A. Strassel says, “producing bipartisan legislation from the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 and the Hatch-Waxman Act of 1984 to the Leahy-Smith Act of 2011.” All these bipartisan efforts to defend American inventors with a strong and fair IP system risk being seriously damaged with this Biden move.

#### Infrastructure investment beats China in the tech-race

Anderson 2/22 [(Norman, Chairman & CEO of CG/LA Infrastructure, a firm focused on global infrastructure project development, driving productivity across countries, and maximizing the benefits of infrastructure for people in the U.S. and around the world) “The Biden Infrastructure Plan - 5 Actions To Jolt Us Awake, Now,” *Forbes*, 2-22-2021, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/normananderson/2021/02/22/the-biden-infrastructure-plan5-actions-to-jolt-us-awake-now/?sh=1d72f17b2ebd>]

The Focus Needs to be on Creating Project Results. Producing immediate results is necessary for our political system - how does this work, when the average highway project takes 9.5 years to move through the approval process, and 4.5 years after that for results - say cars, or autonomous trucks, zipping down the freeway? Lucky for us we are not starting from scratch - we have an enormous pent-up backlog of projects that can start showing results… this year.

By results I don’t just mean creating new and well-paying jobs, or saving the thousands of struggling professional service firms that are in danger of turning off their computers, rather what I mean is addressing the Administration’s priorities in the way that infrastructure professionals think about investment (yes, these people exist - and they are as smart as economists!):

* Brownfield projects - you can revitalize Army Corps reservoirs, or put 5G on interstate highways, or authorize the Gateway tunnel, or make rural broadband really fast, right now, tomorrow,
* Greenfield projects - infrastructure is a ‘thinking short, thinking long’ business, so while you are speeding up investment in ultra high voltage transmission lines, you can also get moving on the Brent Spence Bridge, and by the end of 2024 you can get butts in seats on the Dallas/Houston high speed rail project, and the Great Lakes Basin highway project, and
* New Infrastructure - this is the low-hanging fruit, and the battlefield between China and the U.S. for global influence, period. Largely private, and almost wholly environmentally friendly, this is where our economy has tremendous strengths that we are not seeing. It’s also the battlefield - AI, Machine Learning, 5G, Autonomy, High Voltage Transmission, along with high speed rail - that is critical to the achievement of every single goal that our country can set for the future.

Every infrastructure person - and every citizen - across the country can tell you the five projects that they’d like to see happen. The map above is a 500 project stimulus map that my firm, CG/LA infrastructure, created by polling people around the country. Why not engage citizens now, and show results this year, picking up steam in 2022 and in 2023? Infrastructure is 5G/AI and Electrification, and it Needs a Budget. The infrastructure of the future is going to be as different as cellular is from fixed line telephony, and that future is coming at us extremely fast… The 2020’s will be a decade of disruption - the greatest period of disruption in 100 years or more. We can either continue our course, and try and weather the storm, or we can make the kind of strategic investments that will allow us to lead - with enormous environmental and equity benefits, coupled with the kind of productivity increases that come from rapid innovation. There couldn’t be a bigger difference between the way that China is going about new infrastructure creation, with their top down, devil may care about the individual approach, and our celebration of the individual. The problem - in democracies around the world - is that we are absent, and so China is winning. Leaders Set Goals, Achieve Goals - and Create Trust. Who is in charge of infrastructure? Without an infrastructure office it is hard to tell, and this is a fatal flaw problem. The presidency needs to to bring everyone together to discuss what world we want to create, what our infrastructure vision going forward will look like. This needs to happen fast - and then we need to set goals that we all agree to: projects completed, time to project approvals, life expectancy, reduction of traffic congestion, reduction in carbon by sector, even increases in infrastructure equity. I am a business guy - everything is opportunity. Then we (all of us) need to row hard in the same direction, and achieve those goals. Action This Day. If we can get this right, the results for all of us will be extraordinary - domestic growth, environmental leadership and an injection of strength into the global democratic model. Unimaginable things can quickly be envisioned, and developed, including the return of manufacturing (advanced and distributed manufacturing) to our newly digitized and electrified heartland. Infrastructure can bring us together, but it is a very heavy lift - as in war, the first thing a president things about in the morning, and the last thing he thinks about before going to bed at night.

#### Chinese tech leadership leads to nuclear war

Kroenig 18 (Matthew, Deputy Director for Strategy, Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service, Georgetown University) “Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war?” *BAS*, Nov 12, 2018, <https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war>

Recently, analysts have argued that emerging technologies with military applications may undermine nuclear stability (see here, here, and here), but the logic of these arguments is debatable and overlooks a more straightforward reason why new technology might cause nuclear conflict: by upending the existing balance of power among nuclear-armed states. This latter concern is more probable and dangerous and demands an immediate policy response. For more than 70 years, the world has avoided major power conflict, and many attribute this era of peace to nuclear weapons. In situations of mutually assured destruction (MAD), neither side has an incentive to start a conflict because doing so will only result in its own annihilation. The key to this model of deterrence is the maintenance of secure second-strike capabilities—the ability to absorb an enemy nuclear attack and respond with a devastating counterattack. Recently analysts have begun to worry, however, that new strategic military technologies may make it possible for a state to conduct a successful first strike on an enemy. For example, Chinese colleagues have complained to me in Track II dialogues that the United States may decide to launch a sophisticated cyberattack against Chinese nuclear command and control, essentially turning off China’s nuclear forces. Then, Washington will follow up with a massive strike with conventional cruise and hypersonic missiles to destroy China’s nuclear weapons. Finally, if any Chinese forces happen to survive, the United States can simply mop up China’s ragged retaliatory strike with advanced missile defenses. China will be disarmed and US nuclear weapons will still be sitting on the shelf, untouched. If the United States, or any other state acquires such a first-strike capability, then the logic of MAD would be undermined. Washington may be tempted to launch a nuclear first strike. Or China may choose instead to use its nuclear weapons early in a conflict before they can be wiped out—the so-called “use ‘em or lose ‘em” problem. According to this logic, therefore, the appropriate policy response would be to ban outright or control any new weapon systems that might threaten second-strike capabilities. This way of thinking about new technology and stability, however, is open to question. Would any US president truly decide to launch a massive, bolt-out-of-the-blue nuclear attack because he or she thought s/he could get away with it? And why does it make sense for the country in the inferior position, in this case China, to intentionally start a nuclear war that it will almost certainly lose? More important, this conceptualization of how new technology affects stability is too narrow, focused exclusively on how new military technologies might be used against nuclear forces directly. Rather, we should think more broadly about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The dominant theory of the causes of war in the academy is the “bargaining model of war.” This theory identifies rapid shifts in the balance of power as a primary cause of conflict. International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful bargaining, but when bargaining breaks down, war results. Shifts in the balance of power are problematic because they undermine effective bargaining. After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But shifts in the balance of power muddy understandings of which states have the advantage. You may see where this is going. New technologies threaten to create potentially destabilizing shifts in the balance of power. For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as China has increased its military capabilities. Already, Beijing has become more assertive in the region, claiming contested territory in the South China Sea. And the results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine. Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be decisive for the future of military acquisitions and warfare, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles, quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, “Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.” If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war. If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local military advantage over the United States, for example, it may be more willing than previously to initiate conflict over Taiwan. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member. Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through limited nuclear war strategies, nuclear brinkmanship, or simple accident or inadvertent escalation. This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And the solution is not to preserve second-strike capabilities, but to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly. When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek to maintain an innovation edge. Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states. These are no easy tasks, but the consequences of Washington losing the race for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just might mean nuclear Armageddon.

## Case

#### 1] Lack of access is not a result of IP, but lack of infrastructure – the global south doesn’t have manufacturing capability or the necessary technological know-how to get access

#### Skill Disparities and Trade Secrets outweigh – Moderna proves IP isn’t the root cause.

Silverman 3-15 Rachel Silverman 3-15-2021 "Waiving vaccine patents won’t help inoculate poorer nations" <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/03/15/vaccine-coronavirus-patents-waive-global-equity/> (Rachel Silverman is a policy fellow at the Center for Global Development)//Duong

Reality is more complicated, however. Because of the technical complexity of manufacturing coronavirus vaccines, waiving intellectual-property rights, by itself, would have little effect. It could even backfire, with companies using the move as an excuse to disengage from global access efforts. There are more effective ways to entice — and to pressure — companies to license and share their intellectual property and the associated know-how, without broadly nullifying patents. The Moderna vaccine illustrates the limits of freeing up intellectual property. Moderna announced in October that it would not enforce IP rights on its coronavirus vaccine — and yet it has taken no steps to share information about the vaccine’s design or manufacture, citing commercial interests in the underlying technology. Five months later, production of the Moderna vaccine remains entirely under the company’s direct control within its owned and contracted facilities. Notably, Moderna is also the only manufacturer of a U.S.- or British-approved vaccine not yet participating in Covax, a global-aid-funded effort (including a pledged $4 billion from the United States) to purchase vaccines for use in low- and middle-income countries. It is true, however, that activist pressure — including threats to infringe upon IP rights — can encourage originators to enter into voluntary licensing arrangements. So the global movement to liberate the vaccine patents may be useful, even if some advocates make exaggerated claims about the effects of waivers on their own. We focused on covid. Now our other patients are suffering. One reason patent waivers are unlikely to help much in this case is that vaccines are harder to make than ordinary drugs. Because most drugs are simple chemical compounds, and because the composition of the compounds is easily analyzable, competent chemists can usually reverse-engineer a production process with relative ease. When a drug patent expires, therefore — or is waived — generic companies can readily enter the market and produce competitive products, lowering prices dramatically. Vaccines, in contrast, are complex biological products. Observing their contents is insufficient to allow for imitation. Instead, to produce the vaccine, manufacturers need access to the developer’s “soft” IP — the proprietary recipe, cell lines, manufacturing processes and so forth. While some of this information is confidentially submitted to regulators and might theoretically be released in an extraordinary situation (though not without legal challenge), manufacturers are at an enormous disadvantage without the originator’s cooperation to help them set up their process and kick-start production. Even with the nonconsensual release of the soft IP held by the regulator, the process of trial and error would cause long delays in a best-case scenario. Most likely, the effort would end in expensive failure. Manufacturers also need certain raw ingredients and other materials, like glass vials and filtration equipment; overwhelming demand, paired with disruptive export restrictions, has constricted the global availability of some of these items.

#### 2] Restricting IP protections undermines innovation and profit margins – turns case by precluding vaccine distribution to developing countries.

Cueni 12/10 [(Thomas, Director General of IFPMA, chair of the AMR Industry Alliance, Industry Co-Chair APEC Biopharmaceutical Working Group on Ethics, MA in politics from the London School of Economics) “The Risk in Suspending Vaccine Patent Rules,” New York Times, 12/10/2020] TDI

It is unclear how suspending patent protections would ensure fair distribution. But what is clear is that if successful, the effort would jeopardize future medical innovation, making us more vulnerable to other diseases.

Intellectual property rights, including patents, grant inventors a period of exclusivity to make and market their creations. By affording these rights to those who create intangible assets, such as musical compositions, software or drug formulas — people will invent more useful new things.

Development of a new medicine is risky and costly. Consider that scientists have spent decades — and billions of dollars — working on Alzheimer’s treatments, but still have little to show for it. The companies and investors who fund research shoulder so much risk because they have a shot at a reward. Once a patent expires, generic companies are free to produce the same product. Intellectual property rights underpin the system that gives us all new medicines, from psychiatric drugs to cancer treatments.

In trying to defend these rights, the drug industry has made mistakes in the past that have lost people’s trust. More than 22 years ago, for example, a group of drug companies sued the South African government for trying to import cheaper anti-AIDS drugs amid an epidemic. With price standing between patients and survival, the suit, which the companies eventually dropped, was a terrible misjudgment. The current situation is not parallel.

Several major drug companies, including AstraZeneca, GlaxoSmithKline and Johnson & Johnson, have pledged to offer their vaccines on a not-for-profit basis during the pandemic. Others are considering differential pricing for different countries.As of last month, four major pharmaceutical companies had already agreed to eventually produce at least three billion vaccine doses for low- and middle-income nations, according to one analysis.

In South Africa and India, pharmaceutical companies are already working with local partners to make their vaccines available. Johnson & Johnson has entered into a technology transfer partnership for its candidate vaccine with South Africa’s Aspen Pharmacare, and AstraZeneca has reached a licensing agreement with the Serum Institute of India to develop up to 1 billion doses of its vaccine for low and middle-income countries.

Companies can afford to license patents for free, or sell drugs at cost, precisely because they know that their intellectual property will be protected. That’s not a flaw in the system; it’s how the system ensures that pharmaceutical research will continue to be funded.

### A/2 Indo-Pak War

#### Somos card from 2020 conflict hsoulve happened now also it says covid isn’t to blame for conflicts

#### Limited manufacturing and poor distribution infrastructure outweigh

Khullar 21. [(Dhruv Khullar is a contributing writer at The New Yorker, where he writes primarily about medicine, health care, and politics. He is also a practicing physician and an assistant professor at Weill Cornell Medical College) “India’s Crisis Marks a New Phase in the Pandemic,” The New Yorker, May 13, 2021. <https://www.newyorker.com/science/medical-dispatch/indias-crisis-marks-a-new-phase-in-the-pandemic>] TDI

Jha told me that he worries less about I.P. and incentives than about the practical obstacles to vaccine production. The primary barriers to vaccine availability, he said, are not rigid intellectual-property protections but limited manufacturing capacity and poor distribution infrastructure. Only a small number of companies have the expertise needed to manufacture covid-19 vaccines, especially ones that use new mRNA technology, and scaling up takes time**.** “The world wasn’t ready to produce five or ten billion doses of covid vaccines,” Jha said. “We don’t just have all this excess capacity sitting around. You need raw materials, production capabilities, liner bags, a whole bunch of complex machinery and supplies.” Absent “a broader package of funding, supplies, manufacturing, and people with technical know-how,” Jha said, waiving I.P. rights wouldn’t help India escape the crisis that it faces today**.**

#### COVID reduces the risk of conflict.

Gul 20. [(Ayaz Gul) “Kashmiri Leader: COVID-19 Lowers Chances of Pakistan-India War” VOA News. April 28, 2020. <https://www.voanews.com/south-central-asia/kashmiri-leader-covid-19-lowers-chances-pakistan-india-war>] TDI

ISLAMABAD - Pakistan and India are locked in almost daily military clashes across their Kashmir frontier, but the president of the Pakistani-ruled part of the disputed territory says the coronavirus pandemic has for now diminished chances, if any, of the tensions escalating into a full-blown war. Islamabad and New Delhi routinely accuse each other of firing the first shot that started the clashes in violation of a 2003 mutual truce across what is referred to as the Kashmir Line of Control (LoC). Critics say the increased violence in recent years, however, already has rendered the truce ineffective. The clashes have caused dozens of casualties on both sides, mostly civilians living in villages close to the LoC. “I don’t foresee a war in the near future,” said President Masood Khan of Azad (independent) Jammu and Kashmir (AJK), the official name Pakistan uses for the part of the divided region it administers. India controls the remaining two-thirds of the largely Muslim Himalayan region, claimed by both of the nuclear-armed rival nations. “Right now, the world is preoccupied with the COVID-19 pandemic, and nobody seriously expects India and Pakistan to go to war. And we do not know what the world would look like once this pandemic is over,” Khan told VOA in an interview at his camp office in the Pakistani capital.

#### Deterrence solves Indo-Pak war.

Ganguly 19 [(Sumit, Rabindranath Tagore Chair in Indian Cultures and Civilizations at Indiana University, has been a Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC, a Visiting Fellow at the Center for International Security and Cooperation and at the Center on Democracy, Development and the Rule of Law at Stanford University) “Why the India-Pakistan Crisis Isn’t Likely to Turn Nuclear,” Foreign Affairs, 3/5/2019] TDI

No one can say for sure, but history suggests that there is cause for optimism. During the Kargil War, India worked to contain the fighting to the regions around Pakistan’s original incursions and the war concluded with no real threat of nuclear escalation.

Less than two years later, the two countries plunged into crisis once again. In December 2001, five terrorists from the Pakistan-based groups Lashkar-e-Tabia and Jaish-e-Mohammed attacked the parliament building in New Delhi with AK-47s, grenades, and homemade bombs, killing eight security guards and a gardener. In response, India launched a mass military mobilization designed to induce Pakistan to crack down on terrorist groups. As Indian troops deployed to the border, terrorists from Pakistan struck again. In May 2002, three men killed 34 people in the residential area of an Indian army camp in Kaluchak, in Jammu and Kashmir. Tensions spiked. India seemed poised to unleash a military assault on Pakistan. Several embassies in New Delhi and Islamabad withdrew their nonessential personnel and issued travel advisories. The standoff lasted for several months, but dissipated when it became apparent that India lacked viable military options and that the long mobilization was taking a toll on the Indian military’s men and materiel. The United States also helped ease tensions by urging both sides to start talking. India claimed victory, but it was a Pyrrhic one, as Pakistan failed to sever its ties with a range of terrorist organizations.

Other nuclear states have also clashed without resorting to nuclear weapons. In 1969, China, then an incipient nuclear weapons state, and the Soviet Union, a full-fledged nuclear power, came to blows over islands in the Ussuri River, which runs along the border between the two countries. Several hundred Chinese and Soviet soldiers died in the confrontation. Making matters worse, Chinese leader Mao Zedong had a tendency to run risks and dismissed the significance of nuclear weapons, reportedly telling Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru that even if half of mankind died in a nuclear war, the other half would survive and imperialism would have been razed to the ground. Yet despite Mao’s views, the crisis ended without going nuclear, thanks in part to the efforts of Soviet Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin, who took the first step by travelling to Beijing for talks.

There’s reason to believe that the current situation is similar. Pakistan’s overweening military establishment undoubtedly harbors an extreme view of India and determines Pakistan’s policy toward its neighbor. The military, however, is not irrational. In India, although Prime Minister Narendra Modi has a jingoistic disposition, he, too, understands the risks of escalation, and he has a firm grip on the Indian military.

Another source of optimism comes from what political scientists call the “nuclear revolution,” the idea that the invention of nuclear weapons fundamentally changed the nature of war. Many strategists argue that nuclear weapons’ destructive power is so great that states understand the awful consequences that would result from using them—and avoid doing so at all costs. Indian and Pakistani strategists are no different from their counterparts elsewhere. Even Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan, a political neophyte, underscored the dangers of nuclear weapons in his speech addressing the crisis last week. And Modi, for all his chauvinism, has scrupulously avoided referring to India’s nuclear capabilities.

The decision by India and Pakistan to allow their jets to cross the border represents a major break with the past. Yet so far both countries have taken only limited action. Their principal aim, it appears, is what the political scientist Murray Edelman once referred to as “dramaturgy”—theatrical gestures designed to please domestic audiences. Now that both sides have gone through the motions, neither is likely to escalate any further. Peering into the nuclear abyss concentrates the mind remarkably.

### A/2 South African Violence

#### No great power war over Africa – deterrence solves, and resource interests don’t cause escalation.

Thrall 15. [(Lloyd Thrall is an Associate at the RAND corporation, M.A. in international studies and diplomacy, SOAS, University of London, PhD student in War Studies at King’s College London) "China’s Expanding African Relations Implications for U.S. National Security," 2015, <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR900/RR905/RAND_RR905.pdf>]

There is little credible potential for a Sino-American conflict over resources in Africa. Contrary to popular and perennial assumptions about resource wars, industry and energy analysis sources project adequate supply of conventional hydrocarbons beyond 2035.6 Given reservoir depletion curves, any tightening of supply would be gradual. The adequacy of supply is further augmented when tertiary production and unconventional sources are considered (such as shale and tar sands). U.S. strength in unconventional sources, and potential energy independence, further reduces the likelihood of a conflict. Even in a future with vastly inflated hydrocarbon prices, these costs pale in comparison to those associated with a Sino-American war, the economic costs of which likely fall more heavily on China than the United States.7 Global hydrocarbon resources are distributed via a fungible global market, with many stakeholders and moderate diversity of supply. This enables importing states to buy a predictable supply of hydrocarbons at reasonable and competing prices over long contracts. African sources do not constitute a majority of this supply chain, and supposed victory in a theoretical great-power resource war would not guarantee security of resource supply. In sum, the potential for either China or the United States to be willing to enter war with a nuclear adversary over African oil, let alone other, less valuable resources, is extraordinarily small.8

#### Us and china have interests in other countries

#### Yiesly from 2011 things have changed since then