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#### Interpretation: Precluding a future increase is not a reduction

Melinda **Harmon 12**, Judge, United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, 3/6/12, Zieche v. Burlington Res., Inc., 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30134, p. lexis

Zieche contends that the Court erred when it concluded that "there was no reduction in Zieche's salary or bonus percentage" that would constitute "good reason" for his resignation. Doc. 70 at 8, 9. The Court relied on the fact that Zieche received "his full 2006 performance bonus" after he began working at ConocoPhillips and that the bonus percentage increased from 30% in 2005 to 40% in 2006 as proof that Zieche did not suffer a reduction in salary.

Zieche contends that an increase in his bonus is irrelevant to a determination of whether his salary was reduced because a "bonus is not part of the salary," but is instead [\*12] "something in addition to what is expected or strictly due." Doc. 72 at 4. Additionally, Zieche alleges that "the [C]ourt's analysis ignores the specific provisions of the retention agreement," which defines "good reason" to include "any reduction from your annual rate of base salary." Id.

Initially, although Zieche alleges that ConocoPhillips reduced his salary, he introduced no summary judgment **ev**idence to support this contention. In his Response to ConocoPhillip's Motion for Summary Judgment, Zeiche repeatedly asserts that, in his new position at ConocoPhillips, he would "**not be eligible for annual merit salary *increases***" as he had previously received at Burlington. Doc. 54 at 4 (emph. added). The summary judgment evidence before the Court included Zieche's deposition, in which he admitted that his salary "remained the same . . . up to the time [he] resigned from ConocoPhillips." Doc. 48-1 at 50 (emph. added). Nevertheless, Zieche argues that the Court unnaturally should read the word "reduce" in the retention agreement to mean "**not increase**," rather than interpreting the word according to its plain meaning. **The Court does not agree with this reasoning**, and Zieche has introduced [\*13] no evidence to convince the Court otherwise.

#### Violation: preventing secondary patents precludes a future increase

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits and ground– their model allows affs to defend anything from pandemics to Biden’s presidency— that explodes neg prep and leads to random timeframe of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible

#### 2] Precision o/w – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative preparation because the aff isn’t bound by the resolution.

#### 3] TVA – defend the advantage to a whole rez timeframe. PICs don’t solve – our model allows you to specify countries and medicines.

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation.

#### Drop the debater – a] deter future abuse and b] set better norms for debate.

#### Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices c] Encourages going all in on theory which destroys substantive education
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#### Permissibility and presumption negate – [a] the resolution indicates the aff has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation [b] Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

#### Ethics must begin a priori:

#### [1] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents.

#### [2] Bindingness – I can keep asking “why should I follow this” which results in skep since obligations are predicated on ignorantly accepting rules. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” requires reason which concedes its authority and equally proves agency as constitutive

#### That means we must universally will maxims— any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Prefer the standard: [a] freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves. So its logically incoherent to justify their arguments without first willing that we can pursue ends free from others [b] Frameworks are topicality interps of the word ought so they should be theoretically justified. Prefer on resource disparities—a focus on statistics privileges debaters with the most preround prep which excludes lone-wolfs. A debate under my framework solves since huge files aren’t reuqired

#### 1]The aff violates the categorical imperative and is non-universalizable- governments have a binding obligation to protect creations

**Van Dyke 18** Raymond Van Dyke, 7-17-2018, "The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting," IPWatchdog, <https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/> SJ//DA recut SJKS

As we shall see, applying **Kantian logic entails first acknowledging some basic principles; that the people have a right to express themselves, that that expression (the fruits of their labor) has value and is theirs (unless consent is given otherwise), and that government is obligated to protect people and their property. Thus, an inventor or creator has a right in their own creation, which cannot be taken from them without their consent.** So, employing this canon, **a proposed Categorical Imperative (CI) is the following Statement: creators should be protected against the unlawful taking of their creation by others. Applying this Statement to everyone, i.e., does the Statement hold water if everyone does this, leads to a yes determination. Whether a child, a book or a prototype, creations of all sorts should be protected, and this CI stands.** This result also dovetails with the purpose of government: to protect the people and their possessions by providing laws to that effect, whether for the protection of tangible or intangible things. **However, a contrary proposal can be postulated: everyone should be able to use the creations of another without charge. Can this Statement rise to the level of a CI? This proposal, upon analysis would also lead to chaos. Hollywood, for example, unable to protect their films, television shows or any content, would either be out of business or have robust encryption and other trade secret protections, which would seriously undermine content distribution and consumer enjoyment.** Likewise, inventors, unable to license or sell their innovations or make any money to cover R&D, would not bother to invent or also resort to strong trade secret. Why even create? This approach thus undermines and greatly hinders the distribution of ideas in a free society, which is contrary to the paradigm of the U.S. patent and copyright systems, which promotes dissemination. By allowing freeriding, innovation and creativity would be thwarted (or at least not encouraged) and trade secret protection would become the mainstay for society with the heightened distrust.

#### [2] IPs are a necessary check on companies free-riding off associations of quality which violates the principle of humnity

Wong et al 20 [Liana, Ian, and Shayerah; Analyst in International Trade and Finance; Specialist in International Trade and Finance; Specialist in International Trade and Finance; “Intellectual Property Rights and International Trade,” \*Updated\* 5/12/20; CRS; <https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20200512_RL34292_2023354cc06b0a4425a2c5e02c0b13024426d206.pdf>] Justin

Trademark protection in the United States is governed jointly by state and federal law. The main federal statute is the Lanham Act of 1946 (Title 15 of the United States Code). Trademarks permit the seller to use a distinctive word, name, symbol, or device to identify and market a product or company. Marks can also be used to denote services from a particularly company. The trademark allows quick identification of the source of a product, and for good or ill, can become an indicator of a product's quality. If for good, the trademark can be valuable by conveying an instant assurance of quality to consumers. Trademark law serves to prevent other companies with similar merchandise from free-riding on the association of quality with the trademarked item. Thus, a trademarked good may command a premium in the marketplace because of its reputation. To be eligible for a trademark, the words or symbol used by the business must be sufficiently distinctive; generic names of commodities, for example, cannot be trademarked. Trademark rights are acquired through use or through registration with the PTO.

A related concept to trademarks is geographical indications (GIs), which are also protected by the Lanham Act. The GI acts to protect the quality and reputation of a distinctive product originating in a certain region; however, the benefit does not accrue to a sole producer, but rather the producers of a product originating from a particular region. GIs are generally sought for agricultural products, or wines and spirits. Protection for GIs is acquired in the United States by registration with the PTO, through a process similar to trademark registration.
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#### Text: A nation appointed international panel of scientists including National Academies and corresponding organizations should [reduce intellectual property protections during pandemics] and manage similar conflicts of interest between intellectual property.

#### International panel of science diplomats can rule over IP---that’s key to science diplomacy.

Hajjar and Greenbaum 18 [David; Dean Emeritus and University Distinguished Professor, and Professor of Biochemistry and Pathology at Weill Cornell Medicine, Cornell University. He is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences, a Jefferson Science Fellow of the National Academies at the U.S. Department of State, and a recent Senior Fellow in Science Policy at the Brookings Institute; Steven; Professor and Chair of the Department of Physics and Astronomy at Hunter College of the City University of New York and a Fellow of the American Physical Society. He was a Jefferson Science Fellow of the National Academies at the U.S. Department of State; “Leveraging Diplomacy for Managing Scientific Challenges,” American Diplomacy; September 18; <https://americandiplomacy.web.unc.edu/2018/09/leveraging-diplomacy-for-managing-scientific-challenges-an-opportunity-to-navigate-the-future-of-science/>] Justin

At the global level, science diplomacy is defined as cooperation among countries in order to solve complex problems through scientific research and education (1). For example, science diplomacy plays an important role in resolving global issues related to the ecosystem (such as clean water, food safety, energy conservation, and preservation of the environment). It also addresses problems related to the healthcare industry. For example, scientists have served at the international level to forge the Middle Eastern Cancer Consortium a decade ago to facilitate better healthcare and improve cancer research in the region. Whether one considers science for diplomacy or diplomacy for science, international science collaborations benefit from allowing science diplomats (broadly defined as science envoys, science attaches, embassy fellows) to help establish positive international relationships between the U.S., Europe, Latin America, Africa or Asia, particularly when proprietary disputes arise (2, 3). These various types of science diplomats already exist; some, like embassy fellows and science envoys, have one-year appointments so their role may be limited, while attaches usually have two or three year appointments that may allow them to be more successful in long, protracted negotiations. In any event, we believe that scientists can play more of a role in advancing international scientific cooperation. A key point addressed here is how to balance security concerns against the need for free exchange of information needed for innovation and growth.

Both the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health are already engaged in supporting American science and strengthening collaborations abroad. Such efforts take advantage of international expertise, facilities, and equipment. Here, we provide a rationale for the use of diplomacy to address scientific challenges. This approach allows some scientists working as diplomats to help manage complex and potentially conflicting situations that arise between scientific communities and their governments. Such issues include managing disputes such as licensing agreements for intellectual property (IP) and providing protection of IP.

International collaborations can not only support but also accelerate the advancement of science. However, collaborations may carry risk if IP is misappropriated for other purposes. International collaborations should have a basis in strategy and specific goals (for example, drug discovery) in order to justify the use of government and/or corporate funds.

About a decade ago, a group of academics from the University of Manchester in the United Kingdom assembled the “Manchester Manifesto,” subtitled “Who Owns Science” (6). This document addressed the lack of alignment between commercial interests, intellectual rights, and credit to the researcher. In our (and commonly held) view, the groups representing these disparate values could benefit from diplomatic mediation. More recently, it has become increasing apparent that managing China as a science and technology superpower represents another challenge for the U.S. Resolution of issues such as ownership of IP, rights to reagents, or use of skilled laboratory personnel from international collaborations may require the efforts of science diplomats. There are few international offices or “guardians” to protect junior and senior scientists in corporate or academic sectors from misuse of reagents or piracy.

China’s failure to respect IP rights, and the resulting piracy, has drawn much attention. The media have also focused on the failure of watchdog government agencies to detect and manage these unwanted activities. Industrial espionage compromises U.S. interests. Moreover, Chinese and Russian hackers have cyberattacked U.S. technology companies, financial institutions, media groups, and defense contractors. In 2018, industrial spying was even reported in a major medical school in New York City where scientists were alleged to have illegally shared research findings with Chinese companies.

The U.S. has a long history of hiring research personnel from other countries to staff its laboratories and industrial R&D centers. These scientists and engineers have made critical contributions to our nation’s well-being and security. These young Chinese and South Asian graduates of U.S. programs a generation ago now staff our research enterprise. However, recent trends in U.S. graduate school applications in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) reflect a downturn in foreign applicants, particularly from China. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the number of American-born students seeking STEM degrees is not sufficient to satisfy future demands of our high-tech workforce. While our own educational reforms must be augmented, we cannot ignore the need to continue to recruit overseas talent.

We believe that foreign scientists can continue to make critical discoveries in the U. S. provided that their talent is nurtured, developed, and harnessed for the common good. At the same time, American companies cannot hire foreign scientists if they take the ideas they generate in U.S. laboratories back to their home countries without proper credit or permission. If the advancement of science is to succeed, greater diplomatic cooperation is needed to solve and manage proprietary issues for the benefit of all (5, 6).

So, how does one strike the proper balance between security and growth? Science is a universal social enterprise; international conferences lead to friendships and productive collaborations between nations. Given that the U.S. and Chinese governments recognize the need for international communication and collaboration then surely there should be a mechanism for adjudicating anticipated conflicts. One approach would be for government, industrial, and academic stakeholders to form an international panel of scientists and engineers to manage any conflicts of interest between the need to protect proprietary information crucial to a company’s competitive edge, and the need for students and young faculty members to publish their findings. Smaller scale efforts along these lines have recently given rise to unique global partnerships, such as fellowship support by major pharmaceutical companies, which aim to address these conflicts to the benefit of both parties. An added feature of such arrangements is that they often provide corporate financing for research (9). Can this corporate-academic partnership model be adapted to multinational joint R&D efforts while protecting IP? This question falls squarely within the purview of international science diplomacy, whereby science diplomats can establish rules of conduct governing joint global technology development with proper IP protection.

Despite the highly publicized and legitimate piracy allegations against China, at least some data indicates that the Chinese legal system is responding positively to worldwide pressure to honor foreign IP. A 2016 study by Love, Helmers, and Eberhardt, for example, found that between 2006 and 2011, foreign companies brought over 10 percent of patent infringement cases in China, and won over 70 percent of those cases (10). Today, “win rates” average around 80 percent, and “injunction rates,” around 98 percent (10). As Chinese scientists and engineers increasingly enter the top tier of the innovation space, their growing awareness of their own need for IP protection could be a powerful motivating force for the protection of all IP. As stated earlier, science diplomats could catalyze this progress even further by direct negotiations with those parties involved in the conflicts. An obvious flaw in this optimistic outlook is that scientists in the U.S. wield more influence with their government than scientists in China wield with theirs. And to the extent that the Chinese government could be encouraging IP theft, this must be addressed first by those international companies/firms who want to do business with the Chinese. Chinese investments, as well as tech incubators and targeted acquisitions, can enable access to U.S. technologies for commercial development. Although this conveys a level of risk to the developers, it may provide valuable opportunities for U.S. companies as well. In many respects, the extensive engagement and collaboration in innovation between the U.S. and China, often characterized by open exchanges of ideas, talent, and technologies, can be mutually beneficial in enriching and accelerating innovation in both countries.

In summary, we believe that science diplomats could help address the increasingly complex issues that arise between accelerating scientific and engineering advances, and the need to protect national security and corporate IP. We also propose that this might be accomplished by asking the National Academies to **recommend** academic, corporate, and government scientific leaders to serve on an international scientific advisory board, and for the corresponding organizations in other countries to do the same. Access to the free flow of information promotes new knowledge and innovation. A return to a more restrictive intellectual environment is not only harmful to progress, but also nearly impossible to manage in the current internet age. A good place to start would be to engage the newly appointed head of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (the Science Advisor to the President of the United States), and working groups within established organizations. These organizations include the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) or the National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine, and corresponding international organizations. What incentive is there for a busy and successful scientist to serve in such capacity? It is the same altruism that motivates us to accept assignments as journal editors, manuscript reviewers, or funding agency panelists for the advancement of science toward the greater good.

#### Solves every existential threat.

Haynes 18—research associate in the Neurobiology Department at Harvard Medical School (Trevor, “Science Diplomacy: Collaboration in a rapidly changing world,” <http://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/science-diplomacy-collaboration-rapidly-changing-world/>, dml) // Re-Cut Justin

Today’s world is extremely interconnected. Most of us take this fact for granted, but its implications cannot be overstated. The rate at which information, resources, and people are able to move from one part of the world to another continues to accelerate at an alarming rate. Undoubtedly, this development has done society immense good. In the last century, global life expectancy has doubled, the percentage of people living in extreme poverty has dropped by about 60%, and world literacy rates have increased by a similar margin. But while these statistics paint a promising picture of human civilization, human progress rests on a fragile foundation of international cooperation; the challenges presented by an interconnected world are immense. War, natural disasters, and economic collapse now exert their effects globally, creating economic and ecological disasters and mass human migrations on an unprecedented scale. And with the US pulling out of major multilateral agreements on trade, climate change mitigation, and denuclearization, you might wonder if our ability to collaborate across borders productively is really up to the task.

Global challenges require global solutions, and global solutions require collaboration between countries both big and small, rich and poor, authoritative and democratic. There are few human enterprises capable of providing continuity across these differences, and as technological solutions are becoming available to some of our most pressing issues, two in particular will be necessary to getting the job done: science and diplomacy. While science has long been utilized as a means to reach political ends—think of British explorer James Cook’s mapping of unexplored continents or the United States’ Manhattan Project—a more formal integration of scientists into the diplomatic process is being undertaken. This effort, which has led to scientists and academics playing a direct role in foreign policy development and international relations, has given birth of a new branch of diplomacy: science diplomacy.

What is science diplomacy?

As both the term and concept of science diplomacy have only recently gained traction in scientific and diplomatic circles, it’s been given a variety of definitions. But common to them all is the focus on applying scientific expertise to an international effort. The focus of these efforts is to solve international problems collaboratively while balancing economic prosperity, environmental protection, and societal wellbeing. The challenge of reaching this balance in the face of a booming global population cannot be understated, but this new branch of diplomacy is already at work and is producing results. International agreements such as the Paris Climate Agreement and the Iran Nuclear Deal are two famous examples, and science diplomacy is also establishing international collaboration in many other important arenas. While these lesser known efforts may not dominate the headlines, they are quietly tackling the global issues of today and preparing us for those of tomorrow.

Natural disasters don’t respect national boundaries (and neither does the aftermath)

In 2013, the number of refugees displaced by natural disasters—hurricanes, droughts, earthquakes—outnumbered those displaced by war. Current projections estimate as many as 1 billion people may be displaced by natural disasters by the year 2050. That would mean 1 in 9 people on the planet displaced and looking for a home. Compare this to the estimated 12 million refugees displaced by the war in Syria, and a frightening picture begins to form. As natural disasters continue to increase in both their frequency and intensity, solutions for mitigating the risk of total catastrophe will be underpinned by science, technology, and the ability of the international community to collaborate. Many organizations are starting to tackle these problems through the use of science diplomacy. The center for Integrated Research on Disaster Risk (IRDR) is composed of ten national committees—a network of government sponsored research institutions across the world in countries ranging the political and economic scale. These working groups have committed to improving disaster-risk-reduction science and technology while providing guidance to policy makers charged with implementing disaster prevention and mitigation strategies.

IRDR is governed by a committee comprising experienced scientists and natural disaster experts. Its members come from all over the world—the US, China, Uganda, Norway, Mexico, Venezuela, and more. The diversity of this organization starts at the top and is crucial to developing comprehensive risk-reduction strategies. Data and insights from countries with varying areas of expertise are being shared and built upon, facilitating more accurate natural disaster forecasting and better strategies for mitigating their destructive power. And by including representatives from countries of varying political and economic power in its leadership, IRDR ensures that its work will consider the needs of the global community at large, rather than just nations with considerable wealth and political standing.

The results of this type of international collaboration speak for themselves. Although humanity is grappling with more natural disasters than ever before, deaths related to these incidents continue to trend downward. Operating outside of the typical political framework that dominates foreign relations, IRDR provides a model for effective collaboration across the geopolitical spectrum in the face of a major global issue.

Explore or Exploit? Managing international spaces

Over the last few decades the polar ice cap that covers much of the Arctic Ocean has been shrinking. So much so, that during the warm season vast areas of previously solid ice have become open waters, creating opportunities for new trade routes and exposing the Arctic’s enormous reserves of oil and natural gas. Depending on your values, this will sound either like an opportunity for huge economic development of the region or the inevitable exploitation of one of the last untouched natural territories on the planet. And if you live there, like the half a million indigenous people who currently do, how this territory is managed will determine where you can live, how (and if) you can make a living, and what the health of the ecosystems that have supported Arctic life for millennia will look like.

Luckily, such a scenario was predicted decades ago. In 1987, Mikhail Gorbachev, then leader of the then Soviet Union, delivered a speech outlining his aspirations for the arctic to be explored rather than exploited—to radically reduce military presence, create a collaborative multinational research effort, cooperate on matters of environmental security, and open up the Northern Sea Route for trade. This speech laid the foundation for the Arctic Council (Figure 1), which is one of the most successful examples of science diplomacy at work. Composed of the eight Arctic nations, including geopolitical rivals US and Russia, and numerous groups of indigenous peoples, the Arctic Council was established to maintain Gorbachev’s vision for the region while giving the indigenous peoples a seat at the negotiating table. The council’s activities are conducted by six scientific and technology-based working groups who conduct research in the area and provide knowledge and recommendations to the council members. As a result of this research, and allowing scientists to take part in the negotiations, the Arctic council has enacted several legally binding agreements regarding the sustainable development and environmental protection of the Arctic Ocean. These agreements have facilitated cooperation on a number of important issues including search and rescue operations, prevention and containment of maritime oil pollution, and, most recently, enhanced data sharing and scientific research collaborations. Against a backdrop of rapidly deteriorating diplomatic relations, the US and Russia have co-chaired task forces that laid the foundation for these agreements, proving to the world that meaningful results can be achieved through the avenue of science diplomacy, regardless of geopolitics.

Science diplomacy going forward

The technical expertise that characterizes science diplomacy will continue to be in demand across many realms of foreign policy. For example, synthetic biology and gene-editing technology continue to factor into matters regarding agriculture and trade. Also, digital currencies, such as bitcoin, have changed the way economists and businesses are approaching markets. Finally, machine learning and artificial intelligence are being used by governments as a means for population control, giving rise to a new type of governance—digital authoritarianism.

While this expertise will be necessary for managing such issues, building international coalitions can’t be done through a purely scientific and technical lens. Convincing others to cooperate means providing them with a convincing argument to do so, and in terms they understand and find compelling. To achieve this, scientists must be trained to communicate their expertise in a way that moves stakeholders in policy discussions to act. This means appealing to motivations they have been largely taught to put to the side—whether they be political, economic, or emotional in nature—without obscuring the data and insights they have to offer.

For our leaders, policy makers, and diplomats to effectively understand issues underpinned by science and technology, experts in these fields must continue to be integrated into the mechanisms of governance. With scientists in the US running for elections in numbers like never before, we can expect this trend to continue. And in the face of a rising wave of nationalism across the world, it is crucial that we do everything we can to foster collaboration. The future of human civilization depends on it.

#### Pics are good 1). negflex, negating is harder they get to speak first and last so theyre always ahead on judge psychology and theres a 7-6 timeskew in rebuttal speeches, the neg needs some way to compensate, 2) critical thinking making the 1ar harder forces them to think on their feet which controls the strongest internal link to fairness insofar as it forces big schoolers of their docs C) topic lit- allows us to delve into
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#### Bipartisan infrastructure bill passing now but PC is needed – there is no margin for error.

Kapur et al 9/8 [Sahil, Frank Thorp, and Leigh Ann Caldwell; 9/8/21; Sahil Kapur is a national political reporter for NBC News, Frank Thorp V is a producer and off-air reporter covering Congress for NBC News, managing coverage of the Senate, Leigh Ann Caldwell is an NBC News correspondent; “*Democrats plow 'full speed ahead' on sweeping Biden budget, despite tensions*,” <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/democrats-plow-full-speed-ahead-sweeping-biden-budget-despite-tensions-n1278722>] Justin

WASHINGTON — The top two Democrats said they’re pushing forward with President Joe Biden’s sweeping safety net expansion, as House committees circulate legislative text with hearings scheduled Thursday to start advancing major sections of the bill. “We're moving full speed ahead,” Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer told reporters on a call Wednesday. The New York Democrat effectively cast aside calls by Sen. Joe Manchin, D-W.Va., for a “strategic pause” in the process of crafting the bill, as he voiced concerns about inflation and debt in a recent op-ed for the Wall Street Journal. Schumer is navigating demands by Manchin, as well as Sen. Kyrsten Sinema, D-Ariz., to reduce the price tag that Democrats set at a maximum of $3.5 trillion in the budget resolution. “There are some in my caucus who believe $3.5 trillion is too much; there are some in my caucus who believe it's too little,” Schumer said. “We're going to work very hard to have unity, because without unity, we're not going to get anything.” Speaker Nancy Pelosi said Wednesday the House is moving forward at the $3.5 trillion level. But she left open the possibility of a lower final price tag before the bill becomes law, while promising that “we will get the job done” with “a great bill” that honors Biden’s vision. “We will have our negotiations,” Pelosi, D-Calif., said, when asked by NBC News if the House could pass a bill at a lower amount. “I don’t know what the number will be. We are marking at 3.5 [trillion]. ... We will pay for more than half, maybe all of the legislation.” The remarks by Schumer and Pelosi point to a complicated balancing act, facing a broad range of opinions from centrist lawmakers skeptical of the price tag to progressives who believe $3.5 trillion should be the minimum. Democratic leaders are also juggling an aggressive timeline by seeking to ready the bill by Sept. 27 — the self-imposed House deadline to vote on the separate infrastructure bill — to ensure progressives will support the latter. They are betting Manchin can ultimately be won over on the substance of the package. Lawmakers and committees are keeping options open in case the price tag needs to be cut: For instance, they’ve privately discussed setting some provisions to expire sooner. Manchin has been somewhat vague in his demands. He has not specified what price tag he would support or what provisions of the emerging bill he wants to cut. His office did not have a comment when asked those questions Wednesday. In June, he said on ABC's "This Week" that he wants to “make sure we pay for” the bill. A source close to Manchin said he is a big proponent of targeting benefits on the basis of income and capping them so the money reaches people who need it the most — principles he believes are critical for Democrats' proposals on community college subsidies and on home-based care provisions for the disabled and elderly. Manchin also has issues with the climate change proposals in the legislation, the source said. As chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Manchin has major influence over the climate provisions. His committee was instructed to write legislation costing $198 billion for a clean electricity payment program, consumer rebates to weatherize and electrify homes, the creation of financing for domestic manufacturing of clean energy and auto supply chain technologies and climate research. “He’s not opposed to the overall bill,” the source said. “He’s going to shape the bill to what he feels is closer to the needs. People shouldn’t read into it more than that.” Senate Budget Chair Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., has said if the safety net package does not pass, the $550 billion bipartisan infrastructure package — which Manchin co-wrote — will fail as well. He told reporters the $3.5 trillion level was too low. “To my mind, this bill, that $3.5 trillion, is already the result of a major, major compromise,” Sanders said. “And at the very least, this bill should contain $3.5 trillion.” Pelosi said slashing the cost would require making difficult policy choices. “We have to talk about: What does it take? Where would you cut?” she asked. “Child care? Family medical leave paid for? Universal pre-K? Home health care?” On Thursday, the House committees on ways and means and education and labor will hold hearings on major portions of the bill they released this week. That includes 12 weeks' paid family and medical leave for all workers; expanding Medicare to cover dental, vision and hearing benefits; universal pre-K for 3- and 4-year-olds; and two years' tuition-free community college. Republicans are unified against the effort, leaving Democrats to pass the bill alone under narrow majorities. The package can bypass a Senate filibuster. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., said Wednesday that he hopes Manchin and Sinema “will dig in their heels” against some of the tax increases Democrats are eyeing to finance the package. “It comes down to — in the Senate — to two people,” he said. “Either one of them could kill the whole bill. I don't expect that to happen,” he said. “Either one of them could make dramatic changes in it — that could happen. Or either one of them could basically make a few cosmetic changes and throw in the towel.”

#### Aff doesn’t solve but requires negotiations that saps PC.

Pooley 21 [James; Former deputy director general of the United Nations’ World Intellectual Property Organization and a member of the Center for Intellectual Property Understanding; “Drawn-Out Negotiations Over Covid IP Will Blow Back on Biden,” Barron’s; 5/26/21; <https://www.barrons.com/articles/drawn-out-negotiations-over-covid-ip-will-blow-back-on-biden-51621973675>] Justin

The Biden administration recently announced its support for a proposal before the World Trade Organization that would suspend the intellectual property protections on Covid-19 vaccines as guaranteed by the landmark TRIPS Agreement, a global trade pact that took effect in 1995. The decision has sparked furious debate, with supporters arguing that the decision will speed the vaccine rollout in developing countries. The reality, however, is that even if enacted, the IP waiver will have zero short-term impact—but could inflict serious, long-term harm on global economic growth. The myopic nature of the Biden administration’s announcement cannot be overstated. Even if WTO officials decide to waive IP protections at their June meeting, it’ll simply kickstart months of legal negotiations over precisely which drug formulas and technical know-how are undeserving of IP protections. And it’s unthinkable that the Biden administration, or Congress for that matter, would actually force American companies to hand over their most cutting-edge—and closely guarded—secrets. As a result, the inevitable foot-dragging will cause enormous resentment in developing countries. And that’s the real threat of the waiver—precisely because it won’t accomplish either of its short-term goals of improving vaccine access and facilitating tech transfers from rich countries to developing ones. It’ll strengthen calls for more extreme, anti-IP measures down the road. Experts overwhelmingly agree that waiving IP protections alone won’t increase vaccine production. That’s because making a shot is far more complicated than just following a

recipe, and two of the most effective vaccines are based on cutting-edge discoveries using messenger RNA. As Moderna Chief Executive Stephane Bancel said on a recent earnings call, “This is a new technology. You cannot go hire people who know how to make the mRNA. Those people don’t exist. And then even if all those things were available, whoever wants to do mRNA vaccines will have to, you know, buy the machine, invent the manufacturing process, invent creation processes and ethical processes, and then they will have to go run a clinical trial, get the data, get the product approved and scale manufacturing. This doesn’t happen in six or 12 or 18 months.” Anthony Fauci, the president’s chief medical adviser, has echoed that sentiment and emphasized the need for immediate solutions. “Going back and forth, consuming time and lawyers in a legal argument about waivers—that is not the endgame,” he said. “People are dying around the world and we have to get vaccines into their arms in the fastest and most efficient way possible.” Those claiming the waiver poses an immediate, rather than long-term, threat to IP rights also misunderstand what the waiver will—and won’t—do. The waiver petition itself is more akin to a statement of principle than an actual legal document. In fact, it’s only a few pages long. As the Office of the United States Trade Representative has said, “Text-based negotiations at the WTO will take time given the consensus-based nature of the institution and the complexity of the issues involved.” The WTO director-general predicts negotiations will last until early December. That’s a lot of wasted time and effort. The U.S. Trade Representative would be far better off spending the next six months breaking down real trade barriers and helping export our surplus vaccine doses and vaccine ingredients to countries in need.

#### Infrastructure secures the grid against worsening and increasing cyberattacks.

Carney 21 [Chris; 8/6/21; Senior policy advisor at Nossaman LLC, former US Representative, former professor of political science at Penn State University; "*The US Senate Infrastructure Bill: Securing Our Electrical Grid Through P3s and Grants*," JDSupra, <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-us-senate-infrastructure-bill-4989100/>] Justin

As we begin to better understand the main components of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act that the US Senate is working to pass this week, it is clear that public-private partnerships ("P3s") are a favored funding mechanism of lawmakers to help offset high costs associated with major infrastructure projects in communities. And while past infrastructure bills have used P3s for more conventional projects, the current bill also calls for P3s to help pay for protecting the US electric grid from cyberattacks. Responding to the increasing number of cyberattacks on our nation’s infrastructure, and given the fragile physical condition of our electrical grid, the Senate included provisions to help state, local and tribal entities harden electrical grids for which they are responsible. Section 40121, Enhancing Grid Security Through Public-Private Partnerships, calls for not only physical protections of electrical grids, but also for enhancing cyber-resilience. This section seeks to encourage the various federal, state and local regulatory authorities, as well as industry participants to engage in a program that audits and assesses the physical security and cybersecurity of utilities, conducts threat assessments to identify and mitigate vulnerabilities, and provides cybersecurity training to utilities. Further, the section calls for strengthening supply chain security, protecting “defense critical” electrical infrastructure and buttressing against a constant barrage of cyberattacks on the grid. In determining the nature of the partnership arrangement, the size of the utility and the area served will be considered, with priority going to utilities with fewer available resources. Section 40122 compliments the previous section as it seeks to incentivize testing of cybersecurity products meant to be used in the energy sector, including SCADA systems, and to find ways to mitigate any vulnerabilities identified by the testing. Intended as a voluntary program, utilities would be offered technical assistance and databases of vulnerabilities and best practices would be created. Section 40123 incentivizes investment in advanced cybersecurity technology to strengthen the security and resiliency of grid systems through rate adjustments that would be studied and approved by the Secretary of Energy and other relevant Commissions, Councils and Associations. Lastly, Section 40124, a long sought-after package of cybersecurity grants for state, local and tribal entities is included in the bill. This section adds language that would enable state, local and tribal bodies to apply for funds to upgrade aging computer equipment and software, particularly related to utilities, as they face growing threats of ransomware, denial of service and other cyberattacks. However, under Section 40126, cybersecurity grants may be tied to meeting various security standards established by the Secretary of Homeland Security, and/or submission of a cybersecurity plan by a grant applicant that shows “maturity” in understanding the cyber threat they face and a sophisticated approach to utilizing the grant. While the final outcome of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act may still be weeks or months away, inclusion of these provisions not only demonstrates a positive step forward for the application of federal P3s and grants generally, they also show that Congress recognizes the seriousness of the cyber threats our electrical grids face. Hopefully, through judicious application of both public-private partnerships and grants, the nation can quickly secure its infrastructure from cyberattacks.

#### Cyberattacks on the grid spiral to all-out nuclear conflict.

Klare 19 [Michael; November 2019; Professor emeritus of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College; “*Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation*,” Arms Control Association, <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation>] Justin

Yet another pathway to escalation could arise from a cascading series of cyberstrikes and counterstrikes against vital national infrastructure rather than on military targets. All major powers, along with Iran and North Korea, have developed and deployed cyberweapons designed to disrupt and destroy major elements of an adversary’s key economic systems, such as power grids, financial systems, and transportation networks. As noted, Russia has infiltrated the U.S. electrical grid, and it is widely believed that the United States has done the same in Russia.12 The Pentagon has also devised a plan known as “Nitro Zeus,” intended to immobilize the entire Iranian economy and so force it to capitulate to U.S. demands or, if that approach failed, to pave the way for a crippling air and missile attack.13 The danger here is that economic attacks of this sort, if undertaken during a period of tension and crisis, could lead to an escalating series of tit-for-tat attacks against ever more vital elements of an adversary’s critical infrastructure, producing widespread chaos and harm and eventually leading one side to initiate kinetic attacks on critical military targets, risking the slippery slope to nuclear conflict. For example, a Russian cyberattack on the U.S. power grid could trigger U.S. attacks on Russian energy and financial systems, causing widespread disorder in both countries and generating an impulse for even more devastating attacks. At some point, such attacks “could lead to major conflict and possibly nuclear war.”14

### 5

#### Dollar heg is increasing but is unstable

**Kondo 21** Masaki Kondo, emerging writer/curator | PhD candidate in Cinema & Media Studies ,2-5-2021, ","Bloomberg, <https://www.bloombergquint.com/business/dollar-morphs-into-risk-on-currency-as-u-s-growth-hopes-rebound> SJ//DA

(Bloomberg) **-- Hopes for the U.S. economic recovery seem to be transforming the dollar from a haven asset to the risk-on currency of choice. The currency has been rising in tandem with global equities after three weeks of divergence.** Their inverse correlation weakened to minus 0.46 from a peak of minus 0.73 in July. The Bloomberg Dollar Spot Index showed its changing colors Friday by dropping 0.4 **The greenback’s turnaround is shaking up a consensus on Wall Street that a strengthening recovery would weigh on havens such as the dollar. The opposite appears to be happening, as the prospect of more-generous U.S. government spending from the Biden administration and rising Treasury yields have spurred the currency.** Currency Strategists Reassess Bearish Dollar Calls **It’s still early days to call a trend,** and hedge funds and asset managers remain bearish, according to aggregated data from the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. “**The dollar looks overbought, but optimism toward the currency is strong,”** said Toshiya Yamauchi, chief manager for foreign-exchange margin trading at Ueda Harlow Ltd. in Tokyo. Traders are “ignoring bad catalysts for the dollar but jumping onto good ones.” The rally has rippled across global markets, **with the greenback breaking major resistance lines versus other currencies. It stormed through the 100-day moving average against South Korea’s won**. The dollar also climbed above its 200-day moving average against the yen -- the traditional haven that is often used to fund carry trades -- for the first time since June on Friday. Dollar-Yen Breaks Through Key Milestone With Room to Run: Chart So far **this year the dollar has already advanced 2% versus the yen,** to 105.61. This contrasts with calls for a drop toward the key psychological threshold of 100 yen among forecasters such as Goldman Sachs Group Inc. and JPMorgan Chase & Co. U.S. nonfarm payrolls increased by 49,000 from the prior month, after a downwardly revised 227,000 December decrease, a report showed Friday. The data sent U.S. Treasury yields climbing as much as five basis points to 1.1859% amid increased stimulus bets, before paring gains. The outlook for a further **rise in Treasury yields could support the greenback** as the duo has moved in sympathy over the past few sessions. The U.S. 10-year yield will climb to 1.50% by year-end, according to DBS Group Holdings Ltd., which sees the world’s largest economy as well-placed to recover from the pandemic. A widening yield differential over Japan should help propel the dollar to 108 by the end of June, said Masafumi Yamamoto, chief currency strategist at Mizuho Securities Co. In his view, the combination of U.S. fiscal stimulus, slowing coronavirus infections and vaccine distribution is “a perfect storm.”

#### IPR’s are key to dollar heg and national profits, the aff destroys that

Schwartz 19 Herman Mark Schwartz, professor of politics at the University of Virginia, (2019) American hegemony: intellectual property rights, dollar centrality, and infrastructural power , Review of International Political Economy, 26:3, 496-497, DOI: 10.1080/09692290.2019.1597754 SJ//DA

Pettis (2011) labels the growth cost of current account deficits as the ‘exorbitant burden’, paralleling the ‘exorbitant privilege’ label of the 1960s (see also Gilpin, 1975). Yet suppose we see these deficits and US firms global expansion as features rather than bugs. **To what extent can the case be made that they support US geoeconomic hegemony or dominance**, i.e. that they are a feature not a bug? **Power requires resources** and as Mann (1986) has argued, resources are most efficiently extracted invisibly, that is, via routine compliance not coercion. Routinized extraction is the essence of infrastructural power. This routinized extraction need not be confined within one nation-state ‘container’. Mann (1986, p. 1; 2008, p. 358) problematizes his own definition by noting that ‘we can never find a single bounded society in geographical or social space’ and that ‘there are overlapping, intersecting networks of interaction that have different boundaries. Of [Mann’s] four principal power sources, only political power has formal territorial closure’. **Thus, extraterritorial extensions of laws and routine behaviors can be coded as infrastructural power. How do these routine practices shift resources in the absence of formal territorial control? The larger part of routine extraction is done via politically structured markets that obscure the nature of revenue flows and that rely on internalization of norms and routines producing day-to-day compliance with underlying structures favoring the United States. The major resource flows come indirectly from the central position of the US dollar in the IMS and directly from** trade agreements **securing IPRs possessed by US firms.** The dollar’s centrality allows the United States to import foreign capital (and by accounting definitions this means foreign goods) on a net basis, paying back relatively low rates of return, **while exporting US-controlled capital back to the rest of the world at higher rates of return (Schwartz, 2009). A global banking and financial system centered on US and more generally Anglo-economy firms is the physical counterpart to dollar centrality (Fichtner, 2017; Oatley et al., 2013). Simultaneously,** **the extension of US patent and IPR law through various trade deals has secured the lion’s share of global profits for a narrow slice of US firms, as shown in Sections 2 and 3. Gramscian arguments about hegemony and Bourdieu’s (1977, 2012) arguments about habitus run on rails parallel to Mann’s (1986) neo-Weberian arguments**. Though they differentially weight ‘common sense’ as opposed to material and organizational structures – software as opposed to hardware – **none would dismiss either**. All agree that routinized compliance, to use Mann’s language, has material aspects. Indeed, Foucault (1977) starts ‘Discipline and Punish’ by contrasting the materiality of pre-modern punishment with a subsequent, equally material discussion of the architecture of prisons. Common sense does not float freely but rather is anchored in practices supported by, organized by and flowing through organizations. **Thus, both in the IMS and in trade involving IPRs we should expect to see material structures and ideas congealing into practices that shift resources to the United States and maintain centrality for the dollar.** With respect to ‘software’, the United States, like all other dominant powers, consciously exported its policy paradigms to and consciously cultivated a culturally cohesive set of elites in other states in the global economy (Ban, 2016; Costigliola, 1984; De Grazia, 2009; Pijl, 1984; Slobodian, 2018). **These efforts to create a ‘cohesive ruling class culture’** (Mann, 1986, p. 167) were never perfect, as Zeitlin and Herrigel (2000) and Maier (1987) show for the export of US production practices in the 1950s and 1960s and as Ban (2016) shows for the export of ‘neo-liberal’ ideology in the 2000s. Nonetheless, the broader financial community, encompassing banks, finance ministries and central banks, constitute overlapping epistemic communities. While Ban (2016) takes pains to show the limits to **US ideological influence** and the localization of economic knowledge, his analysis highlights the way that US economics PhD programs and post-docs nonetheless produced a ‘software’ devoid of heterodox approaches to policy problems. The development of investment bank habitus is even stronger given the huge material rewards and the fact that most investment banking operations are physically located in the Anglo-economies. Both the recruitment of personnel and social practices (including lifestyle) thus are imbued with the sensibility of the Anglo-dominated financial community.

#### Medical IPR is uniquely key, **creates a slippery slope to other sectors and is needed for US market share**

Duesterberg 21 [Thomas; Senior fellow at the Hudson Institute. An expert on trade, manufacturing, economics and foreign policy, he leads project work on trade with Europe and China; “Biden says he wants to out-compete China — so why attack US medical innovation?,” The Hill; 6/3/21; <https://thehill.com/opinion/healthcare/556043-biden-says-he-wants-to-out-compete-china-so-why-attack-us-medical>] Justin+ SJ//DA

Congress has been burning the midnight oil to pass legislation aimed at investing billions of dollars to out-compete China in critical sectors and champion American innovation. **Yet at the very moment that value of the U.S. model of medical innovation is being most vindicated, that model has come under attack from our own government, as well as long-time critics in the developing world. These critics are proposing to waive the intellectual property (IP) rights guaranteed by the World Trade Organization (WTO) for vaccines and treatments for COVID-19** — a move that would undermine the economic model of innovation that produced the historically unprecedented effectiveness, and speed to market, of vaccines developed by major U.S. and British firms. The assault — spearheaded by South Africa and India — is not only unlikely to help get more vaccines to the developing world in a timely manner, but has the potential to unravel decades of progress in building an internationally agreed regime for IP rights, which incentivizes and rewards fundamental research and long-term capital investment. This could harm not only the medical products industry, but also spill over to other high-technology sectors that require long years of research and huge, risky capital investments before bearing fruit. Proponents of the waiver argue that it would facilitate more rapid production and distribution of much-needed shots for hard hit regions in South Asia and Africa. However, it’s well-established that any increased production — even in India, which is home to the world’s largest manufacturer of vaccines — would require at least a year of preparation and investment to begin large-scale production of the newer vaccines. What’s more, opponents to the waiver — led by European countries, home to the world’s second leading medicines industry — can delay the waiver approval for months at the WTO, if not bury the idea altogether. And with plans in place to ramp up production of approved vaccines in the U.S., Europe and India, there will be sufficient surplus production to start exporting to the global South later this summer. Any forced transfer of the new vaccines technologies almost certainly will benefit China, with its growing manufacturing prowess and ambitions to spend whatever is required to offset the damage to its reputation resulting from its attempt to mask the severity of the SARS-CoV-2 virus in the early days of the pandemic. A closer look at the South Africa-India waiver proposal, which is supported by some 100 other nations, gives insight into the longer-term and broader danger of the reversal of IP rights protections for advanced technologies. Their language tabled at the WTO in late May calls for waiving not only the fundamental patents behind COVID-19 vaccines but extending the waiver to products including “diagnostics, therapeutics, medical devices, personal protective equipment” and to the raw materials and “means of manufacture” of anything used to contain this virus. **It is not a huge leap of logic to speculate that such broad waivers, in the future, could be suggested for any severe threat to world health, with the example of treatments for AIDS as a reminde**r. The proposed waiver would extend for a period of “at least three years,” and could be lifted only by agreement in the General Council of the WTO, which requires unanimous consent of all 164 members and rarely has been achieved since its inception in 1995. **It is hard to imagine that once the long-sought goal of removing IP rights protection for medical technologies — supported by developing countries and by progressive groups in developed countries alike — is achieved, it can be reversed easily. Other high-technology industries characterized by the need for long-term investments in basic research and the development of new manufacturing technologies such as semiconductors, medical equipment or aerospace, or nascent industries such as quantum computing, robotics or 3D printing, would be wise to pay attention to the debate over waiving IP rights for COVID-19 vaccines**. **While the acute and existential issues arising from a pandemic represent a perhaps unique set of circumstances, one can conceive of arguments to justify the social goal of sharing some newer technologies.** For example, **if innovations in “green hydrogen,” more powerful batteries,** or more efficient photovoltaic cells are achieved and promise early **returns to combat climate change, the advantages of sharing the technologies for the global common good could be adduced to justify waivers** in the appropriate enabling technologies. **Or, would a waiver be considered for the advanced semiconductors and computers** required for artificial intelligence and needed to find cures for cancer and to perfect climate mitigation strategies? **U.S. support for the vaccine IP rights waiver is especially baffling because it affects one of its most successful industries in terms of global technology leadership and market share**, responsible for so many advances of enormous benefit for global health. **It is not a mystery why the rapid discovery and ramping up of production for new vaccines came from the unique U.S. innovation ecosystem, in contrast to the more highly regulated and centrally controlled health care sectors in much of the rest of the world.** Menendez 'disappointed' in Biden administration over Afghanistan... Overnight Defense: US scrambles to get Americans out of Kabul There are better ways to achieve the goal of eradicating COVID-19, and U.S. actions would be more effective if directed toward expanding production and assisting in the distribution of vaccines. This includes the use of foreign aid and help with purchasing agreements for countries in the global South, as well as facilitating licensing agreements. (For example, Johnson & Johnson is arranging a major project with Indian manufacturers, which has the support of the other Quad countries, Japan, Australia and the U.S.) If Congress truly cares about protecting American innovation, it ought to assert its constitutional authority over international trade to block this danger to domestic high-technology industries.

## Impacts

### Impact – Nuke War

#### Dollar Heg solves conflict, international instability, and a laundry list of existential impacts

Zoffer 20 Joshua Zoffer 2-3-2020 “To End Forever War, Keep the Dollar Globally Dominant” <https://newrepublic.com/article/156417/end-forever-war-keep-dollar-globally-dominant> (Investor at Cove Hill Partners, Fellow at New America, JD Candidate at Yale University Law School, AB from Harvard University)//Elmer

In early 2016, Obama Treasury Secretary Jack Lew cautioned that the dollar’s dominance as a global currency rested, in part, on the U.S. government’s reluctance to fully weaponize it. If foreign markets and governments “feel that we will deploy sanctions without sufficient justification or for inappropriate reasons,” he warned, “we should not be surprised if they look for ways to avoid doing business in the United States or in U.S. dollars.” Lew’s case stemmed from the more fundamental view that the dollar’s international role is “a source of tremendous strength for our economy, a benefit for U.S. companies and a driver of U.S. global leadership”—in other words, a role worth keeping. This view is emblematic of American financial governance since the Second World War. U.S. economic analysts, especially at the Treasury, have jealously guarded the dollar’s role and the many benefits it offers: the ability to run large deficits at low cost and disproportionate influence over the structure of the global economy, among others. Yet in their recent article in The New Republic, David Adler and Daniel Bessner argue the U.S. should abandon these advantages. In their view, the dollar’s role has encouraged American militarism and should be relinquished to curb such behavior. Dollar hegemony is not without cost, but to renounce it would be a profound mistake. Adler and Bessner’s view neglects the sizable economic benefits the dollar’s role confers on the U.S., as well as its possible use as an antidote to military adventurism. It ignores the enormous good that can be done with deficit spending, much of which has gone to the American military but could instead fund progressive programs. And it elides the inability of the U.S. and its global trading partners to shift away from dollar dominance without creating worldwide financial distress. Adler and Bessner are right that the U.S. has misused its privilege, but Washington should not abandon it; rather, American leaders should seek to transform it. Generations of American policymakers have been right to protect the dollar’s key currency role for economic reasons. Most notably, dollar hegemony affords the U.S. the ability to run large and prolonged budget and balance-of-payments deficits. The dollar represents 62 percent of allocated foreign exchange reserves, is used to invoice and settle roughly half of world trade, and accounts for 42 percent of global payments. Because governments, banks, and businesses worldwide need lots of dollars, the world market always stands ready to absorb new U.S.-dollar-denominated debt without charging higher interest rates. Adler and Bessner correctly point out that the rest of the world considers the dollar’s role as the world’s reserve currency to be an “exorbitant privilege,” a term coined in the 1960s by then French Finance Minister Valéry Giscard D’Estaing. The ability to spend beyond its means has enabled the U.S. to fund its impressive military might, whether one views that power as the fountainhead of Pax Americana or the source of illegitimate military adventurism. But these economic benefits go beyond just deficits. The demand for dollars also pushes up the dollar’s value against other currencies, enhancing American purchasing power and offering consumers access to imports on the cheap. The dollar’s role also means American firms rarely need to do business in foreign currencies, reducing transaction costs and exchange-rate risks. More broadly, America’s central economic role gives it outsize influence at crucial moments. At the height of the financial crisis that began in 2008, the Federal Reserve was able to inject vital liquidity into the global financial system by selectively offering dollar swap lines to trusted foreign central banks. Dollar hegemony enabled the U.S. to act swiftly, effectively, and on its own terms. In addition, the dollar’s role offers a potent alternative to kinetic military action as a means of pursuing foreign policy objectives. The dollar’s broad use means access to dollar liquidity—which in turn requires access to the U.S. financial system—is essential for foreign governments and businesses. For foreign banks, especially, being cut off from dollar access is essentially a death sentence. That makes sanctions that do so a powerful tool in the international arena. In 2005, for example, the U.S. used the dollar to strike a devastating blow against North Korea without firing a single shot or even formally enacting sanctions. Using authority provided by Section 311 of the Patriot Act, the Department of the Treasury crippled Banco Delta Asia, a bank accused of facilitating illegal activity by the North Korean government, by merely threatening to cut off its access to the American financial system. Deposit outflows began within days; within weeks the bank was placed under government administration to avoid a full collapse. Pyongyang was hit hard, as other banks ceased their business with it to avoid meeting the same fate. Similarly, though the Trump administration has worked hard to undo it, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran to limit the development of nuclear weapons was made possible, in part, by painful dollar sanctions that brought Iran to the table. Far from being a proximate cause of military conflict, the dollar’s central global role has often been used to contain adversaries without military intervention. Still, skeptics are right to point out that the dollar’s role has indirectly funded American interventionism and that dollar sanctions have been overused, provoking the ire of American allies. But these facts suggest we should use our dollar power to forge a more progressive U.S. order, not abandon the advantage altogether. America’s exorbitant privilege need not fund warships and missiles: The same low-interest borrowing could be used to fund a new universal health care system, expand access to higher education, or pursue any number of large-scale social policy objectives, including financing global public goods that no other country or consortium of countries is prepared to fund, such as climate change mitigation

### Case

#### NC theory over aff theory and Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is biased since the 2AR respond to the 2NR with new answers means they autowin, flips infinite abuse so reject it – reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging and preventing super abusive 1NCs. b] Structural skew: 7-6 time 2-1 speech skew for offense favors the Aff who speaks first and last and set the stage with a persuasive advantage so [c] No infinite abuse: 1NC is 7 minutes and 1AC spikes check

#### RVIs on 1AR theory –they are 20 seconds long shells but forces the 2N overallocate so they’re key for timeskew

### fw

#### Utilitarianism is morally repugnant:

#### 2] Because only consequences determine if specific actions are good or bad, utilitarianism justifies horrific conclusions since no state of affairs could ever be intrinsically bad in and of itself. Vallentyne 6

Vallentyne, Peter. Against Maximizing Act-Consequentialism. 2006, mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10355/10174/AgainstMaximizingActConsequentialism.pdf?sequence=1.

**If core consequentialism is true, then any action with maximally good consequences (in a given choice situation) is permissible**. The main argument in favor of this claim is the following: **P1: An action is morally permissible if it is best supported by insistent moral reasons for action. P2: The value of consequences is always an insistent moral reason for action.** **P3: The value of consequences is the only insistent moral reason for action. C: Thus, an action is morally permissible if it maximizes the value of consequences**. This is the same argument given in the previous section for the impermissibility of actions that do not have maximally good consequences, except that (1) **the appeal to insistent reasons has been made explicit, (2) the necessary conditions of the original P1 and C have been converted to sufficient conditions, and (3) the qualification in P3 that allowed the possibility of some prior constraints has been dropped. P1 is highly plausible. An action that is best supported by insistent moral reasons is surely permissible. P2 can be challenged, a**s I did earlier, on the ground that beyond some point the value of consequences ceases to be an insistent moral reason (once consequences are good enough, their value may only be a non-insistent reason). For the present purposes, however, we can grant this claim. The crucial claim is P3. It is implausible, because there are insistent moral reasons other than the value of consequences. There are also deontological insistent reasons, and these, or at least some of these, are lexical prior to the value of consequences. In particular, **individuals have certain rights that may not be infringed simply because the consequences are better.** Unlike prudential rationality, morality involves many distinct centers of will (choice) or 15 interests, and these cannot simply be lumped together and traded off against each other.16 **The basic problem with standard versions of core consequentialism is that they fail to recognize adequately the normative separateness of persons.** Psychological autonomous beings (as well, perhaps, as other beings with moral standing) are not merely means for the promotion of value. **They must be respected and honored**, and this means that at least sometimes certain things may not be done to them, even though this promotes value overall. **An innocent person may not be killed against her will, for example, in order to make a million happy people slightly happier. This would be sacrificing her for the benefit of others.**

#### Accessibility is a voting issue- It’s a prerequisite to accessing the space in the first place and things like racism are intuitively wrong

#### Thus the alternative is to drop the debater—Racist arguments make ppl feel unsafe in debate, so you should vote them down

#### Consequences Fail: a] Every action has infinite stemming consequences, because every consequence can cause another consequence so we can’t predict. b] Induction is circular because it relies on the assumption that nature will hold uniform and we could only reach that conclusion through inductive reasoning based on observation of past events. c] Every action is infinitely divisible, only intents unify because we commit the end point of an action – but consequences cannot determine what step of action is moral d] Yes act/omission distinction – there are infinite events occurring over which you have no control, so you can never be moral

### Adv

#### Companies will just obtain a patent in a different sector.

Thomas 15 [John R; Visiting Scholar, CRS; “Tailoring the Patent System for Specific Industries, Congressional Research Service,” CRS; 2015; <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R43264/7>] Justin

In view of the concerns noted above, commentators have gone so far to say that “it has become increasingly difficult to believe that a one-size-fits-all approach to patent law can survive.”75 To the extent the current patent system creates a blanket set of rules that apply comparably to distinct industries, it likely over-encourages innovation in some contexts and under-incentivizes it in others.76 Further, some observers have asserted that the need of firms to identify and access the patented inventions of others may differ among industries.77 As a result, the case can be made that distinct industrial, technological, and market characteristics that exist across the breadth of the U.S. economy compel industry-specific patent statutes. However, others have questioned the wisdom and practicality of such line-drawing.78 The following concerns, among others, have been identified:

• Over its long history, the U.S. patent system has flexibly adapted to new technologies such as biotechnology and computer software. Legislative adoption of technology-specific categories may leave unanticipated, cutting-edge technologies outside the patent system.79

• Defining a specific industry or category of technologies may prove to be a contested proposition.

80 • Over time, new industries may emerge and old industries may consolidate. The dynamic nature of the U.S. economy suggests greater need for legislative oversight within a differentiated patent regime.

81 • Even if an industry or technology remains relatively stable, the innovation environment within it might change. For example, technological or scientific advances might open new possibilities for research and development within hidebound industries—but also increase expense and risk for those firms.

82 • Distinct patent rights among industries or technologies may lead to strategic behavior on behalf of patent applicants. For example, a computer program that controls a fuel injector within an automobile could possibly be identified as either an automobile-related or a computer-related invention.

83 •The legislative effort to enact sector-specific patent laws may provide an opportunity for politically savvy firms to exert more lobbying and political power, at the possible expense of less sophisticated firms.