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#### Interpretation: “medicines” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for a medicine or subset of medicines.

Nebel 19. [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution.” Vbriefly. August 12, 2019. <https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/?fbclid=IwAR0hUkKdDzHWrNeqEVI7m59pwsnmqLl490n4uRLQTe7bWmWDO_avWCNzi14> TG

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions.

Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window.

So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why.

“Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons.

First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural.

Second, “colleges and universities” fails the [upward-entailment test](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#IsolGeneInte) for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals.

Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universitiesz generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution.

#### Violation: They spec \_\_\_\_\_\_

#### Standards:

#### [1] precision – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Independent voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### [2] Limits and ground – their model allows affs to defend anything from Covid vaccines, HIV drugs, Insulin, antiobiotics, CRISPR, cancer, cannabis— there's no universal DA since each has different functions and political implications — that explodes neg prep and leads to random medicine of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible — limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep and it takes out ground like DAs to certain medicines which are some of the few neg generics when affs spec medicines.

#### [3] TVA solves – you could’ve read your plan as an advantage under a whole res advocacy. Potential abuse doesn’t justify in round abuse, and having no prep leads to cheaty word PICs and Process Cps which are net worse

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate – all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to be justified.

#### 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, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices c] Kills norm setting since debaters can never admit they’re wrong – outweighs since norm setting is the constitutive purpose of theory d] Going all in on theory kills substance education which outweighs on timeframe

#### Rzn on 1AR theory- 2AR responses to the 2NR CI are new and there’s no 3NR to respond- makes it irresolvable

#### DTA on 1AR theory- they can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min, while I have to spend 2:30 on it- o/w on quantifiability
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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

## 3

#### The US is leading the biopharmaceuticals race – but China is close. Catching up would be a death sentence for US lead.

Gupta 21 [Gaurav; Physician, founder of the biotechnology investment firm Ascendant BioCapital; “As Washington Ties Pharma’s Hands, China Is Leaping Ahead,” Barrons; 6/11/21; <https://www.barrons.com/articles/as-washington-ties-pharmas-hands-china-is-leaping-ahead-51623438808>] Justin

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 were invented by U.S. biopharma companies, with homegrown startups 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. China saw over $28 billion 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 plan gives away sensitive biotechnology information that facilitates a China lead.

Rogin 21 [Josh; Columnist for the Global Opinions section of the Washington Post and a political analyst with CNN. Previously, he has covered foreign policy and national security for Bloomberg View, Newsweek, the Daily Beast, Foreign Policy magazine, Congressional Quarterly, Federal Computer Week magazine and Japan’s Asahi Shimbun newspaper. He was a 2011 finalist for the Livingston Award for Young Journalists and the 2011 recipient of the Interaction Award for Excellence in International Reporting. Rogin holds a BA in international affairs from George Washington University and studied at Sophia University in Tokyo. He lives in Washington, DC; “Opinion: The wrong way to fight vaccine nationalism,” The Washington Post; 4/8/21; <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/global-opinions/the-wrong-way-to-fight-vaccine-nationalism/2021/04/08/9a65e15e-98a8-11eb-962b-78c1d8228819_story.html>] Justin

Americans will not be safe from covid-19 until the entire world is safe. That basic truth shows why vaccine nationalism is not only immoral but also counterproductive. But the simplest solutions are rarely the correct ones, and some countries are using the issue to advance their own strategic interests. The Biden administration must reject the effort by some nations to turn our shared crisis into their opportunity.

As the inequities of vaccine distribution worldwide grow, a group of more than 50 developing countries led by India and South Africa is pushing the World Trade Organization to dissolve all international intellectual property protections for pandemic-related products, which would include vaccine research patents, manufacturing designs and technological know-how. The Trump administration rejected the proposal to waive the agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) for the pandemic when it was introduced in October.

Now, hundreds of nongovernmental organizations and dozens of Democratic lawmakers are pushing the Biden administration to support the proposal. But many warn the move would result in the United States handing over a generation of advanced research — much of it funded by the U.S. taxpayer — to our country’s greatest competitors, above all China.

In Congress, there’s justified frustration with the United States’ failure to respond to China’s robust vaccine diplomacy, in which Beijing has conditioned vaccine offers to pandemic-stricken countries on their ignoring security concerns over Chinese telecom companies or abandoning diplomatic recognition of Taiwan. There’s also a lot of anger at Big Pharma among progressives for profiting from the pandemic.

“We are in a race against time, and unfortunately Big Pharma is standing in the way of speedily addressing this problem,” Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-Ill.), who supports the effort to waive intellectual property protections, told me in an interview. “I think the real security issue is that while the United States balks in making sure that we help ourselves, that these adversaries will just jump right in.”

Schakowsky argued that alternative measures for helping poor countries manufacture vaccines are simply not moving fast enough to save lives and that the United States has a duty to respond. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) personally conveyed her support for the waiver to President Biden, Schakowsky said.

But Big Pharma is just one piece of the puzzle. Countries such as India and South Africa have been trying to weaken WTO intellectual property protections for decades. The mRNA technology that underpins the Pfizer and Moderna vaccines was funded initially by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and has national security implications.

Inside the Biden administration, the National Security Council has already convened several meetings on the issue. The waiver is supported by many global health officials in the White House and at the U.S. Agency for International Development, who believe the United States’ international reputation is suffering from its perceived “America First” vaccine strategy.

On Wednesday, U.S. Trade Representative Katherine Tai spoke with WTO Director General Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala about the waiver issue. USTR is convening its own interagency meetings on the issue, which many see as a move to reassert its jurisdiction over WTO matters.

If and when this does get to Biden’s desk, he will also hear from national security officials who believe that waiving TRIPS would result in the forced transfer of national security-sensitive technology to China, a country that strives to dominate the biotechnology field as part of its Made in China 2025 strategy. Once countries such as China have this technology, they will apply their mercantilist industrial models to ensure their companies dominate these strategically important industries, potentially erasing thousands of U.S. jobs.

“We would be delivering a competitive advantage to countries that are increasingly viewed as our adversaries, at taxpayer expense, when there are other ways of doing this,” said Mark Cohen, senior fellow at the University of California at Berkeley Law School.

#### Gains are directly converted to military prowess – destroys US primacy.

Kuo 17 [Mercy A; Executive Vice President at Pamir Consulting; “The Great US-China Biotechnology and Artificial Intelligence Race,” The Diplomat; 8/23/17; <https://thediplomat.com/2017/08/the-great-us-china-biotechnology-and-artificial-intelligence-race/>] TDI // Re-Cut Justin

Trans-Pacific View author Mercy Kuo regularly engages subject-matter experts, policy practitioners, and strategic thinkers across the globe for their diverse insights into the U.S. Asia policy. This conversation with Eleonore Pauwels – Director of Biology Collectives and Senior Program Associate, Science and Technology Innovation Program at the Wilson Center in Washington D.C. – is the 104th in “The Trans-Pacific View Insight Series.”

Explain the motivation behind Chinese investment in U.S. genomics and artificial intelligence (AI).

With large public and private investments inland and in the U.S., China plans to become the next AI-Genomics powerhouse, which indicates that these technologies will soon converge in China.

China’s ambition is to lead the global market for precision medicine, **which necessitates acquiring strategic tech**nological and human capital in both genomics and AI. And the country excels at this game. A sharp blow in this U.S.-China competition happened in 2013 when BGI purchased Complete Genomics, in California, with the intent to build its own advanced genomic sequencing machines, therefore securing a technological knowhow mainly mastered by U.S. producers.

There are significant economic incentives behind China’s heavy investment in the increasing convergence of AI and genomics. This golden combination will drive precision medicine to new heights by developing a more sophisticated understanding of how our genomes function, leading to precise, even personalized, cancer therapeutics and preventive diagnostics, such as liquid biopsies. By one estimate, the liquid biopsy market is expected to be worth $40 billion in 2017.

Assess the implications of iCarbonX of Shenzhen’s decision to invest US$100 million in U.S.-company PatientsLikeMe relative to AI and genomic data collection.

iCarbonX is a pioneer in AI software that learns to recognize useful relationships between large amounts of individuals’ biological, medical, behavioral and psychological data. Such a data-ecosystem will deliver insights into how an individual’s genome is mutating over time, and therefore critical information about this individual’s susceptibilities to rare, chronic and mental illnesses. In 2017, iCarbonX invested $100 million in PatientsLikeMe, getting a hold over data from the biggest online network of patients with rare and chronic diseases. If successful, this effort could turn into genetic gold, making iCarbonX one of the wealthiest healthcare companies in China and beyond.

The risk factor is that iCarbonX is handling more than personal data, but potentially vulnerable data as the company uses a smartphone application, Meum, for customers to consult for health advice. Remember that the Chinese nascent genomics and AI industry relies on cloud computing for genomics data-storage and exchange, creating, in its wake, new vulnerabilities associated with any internet-based technology. This phenomenon has severe implications. How much consideration has been given to privacy and the evolving notion of personal data in this AI-powered health economy? And is our cyberinfrastructure ready to protect such trove of personal health data from hackers and industrial espionage? In this new race, will China and the U.S. have to constantly accelerate their rate of cyber and bio-innovation to be more resilient? Refining our models of genomics data protection will become a critical biosecurity issue.

Why is Chinese access to U.S. genomic data a national security concern?

**Genomics** and computing research **is inherently dual-use, therefore a strategic advantage in a nation’s security arsenal.**

Using AI systems to understand how the functioning of our genomes impacts our health **is of strategic importance for biodefense.** This knowledge will lead to increasing developments at the forefront of medical countermeasures, **including vaccines**, antibiotics, and targeted treatments relying on virus-engineering and microbiome research. Applying deep learning to genomics data-sets could help geneticists learn how to use genome-editing (CRISPR) to efficiently engineer living systems, but also to treat and, even “optimize,” human health, **with potential applications in military enhancements**. A $15 million partnership between a U.S. company, Gingko Bioworks, and DARPA aims to genetically design new probiotics as a protection for soldiers against a variety of stomach bugs and illnesses.

China could be using the same deep learning techniques on U.S. genomics data to better comprehend how to develop, patent and manufacture tailored cancer immunotherapies in high demand in the United States. Yet, what if Chinese efforts venture into understanding how to impact key genomics health determinants relevant to the U.S. population? **Gaining access to increasingly large U.S. genomic data-sets gives China a knowledge advantage into leading the next steps in bio-military research.**

Could biomedical data be used to develop bioweapons? Explain.

Personalized medicine advances mean that personalized bio-attacks are increasingly possible. The combination of AI with biomedical data and genome-editing technologies will help us predict genes most important to particular functions. Such insights will contribute to knowing how a particular disease occurs, how a newly-discovered virus has high transmissibility, but also why certain populations and individuals are more susceptible to it. Combining host susceptibility information with pathogenic targeted design, **malicious actors could engineer pathogens that are tailored to overcome the immune system or the microbiome of specific populations.**

#### That causes extinction.

Yulis 17 [Max; Major in PoliSci, Penn Political Review; “In Defense of Liberal Internationalism,” Penn Political Review; 4/8/17; <http://pennpoliticalreview.org/2017/04/in-defense-of-liberal-internationalism/>] // Re-Cut Justin

Over the past decade, international headlines have been bombarded with stories about the unraveling of the post-Cold War world order, the creation of revolutionary smart devices and military technologies, the rise of militant jihadist organizations, and nuclear proliferation. Indeed, times are paradoxically promising and alarming. In relation to treating the world’s ills, fortunately, there is a capable hegemon– one that has the ability to revive the world order and traditionally hallmarked human rights, peace, and democracy. The United States, with all of its shortcomings, had crafted an international agenda that significantly impacted the post-WWII landscape. Countries invested their ambitions into security communities, international institutions, and international law in an effort to mitigate the chances of a nuclear catastrophe or another World War. The horrors and atrocities of the two Great Wars had traumatized the global community, which spurred calls for peace and the creation of a universalist agenda. Today, the world’s fickle and declining hegemon still has the ability, but not the will, to uphold the world order that it had so carefully and eagerly helped construct. Now, the stakes are too high, and there must be a mighty and willing global leader to lead the effort of diffusing democratic ideals and reinforcing stability through both military and diplomatic means. To do this, the United States must abandon its insurgent wave of isolationism and protectionism, and come to grips with the newly transnational nature of problems ranging from climate change to international terrorism.

First, the increase in intra-state conflict should warrant concern as many countries, namely in Africa and the Middle East, are seeing the total collapse of civil society and government. These power vacuums are being filled with increasingly ideological and dangerous tribal and non-state actors, such as Boko Haram, ISIS, and Al-Shabaab. Other bloody civil wars in Rwanda, Sudan, and the Congo have contributed to the deaths of millions in the past two decades. As the West has seen, however, military intervention has not been all that successful in building and empowering democratic institutions in the Far East. A civil crusade, along with the strengthening of international institutions, may in fact be the answer to undoing tribal, religious, and sectarian divisions, thereby mitigating the prospects of civil conflict. During the Wilsonian era, missionaries did their part to internationalize the concept of higher education, which has contributed to the growth of universities in formerly underdeveloped countries such as China and South Korea.[1] In addition, the teachings of missionaries emphasized the universality of humanity and the oneness of man, which was antithetical to the justifications for imperialism and the rampant sectarianism that plagued much of the Middle East and Africa.[2] Seeing that an increase in the magnitude of human casualty is becoming more of a reality due to advancements in military technology and the increasing outbreaks of civil war, international cooperation and the diffusion of norms that highlight the importance of stable governance, democracy, and human rights is the only recourse to address the rise in sectarian divides and civil conflicts. So long as the trend of the West’s desire to look inward continues, it is likely that nation states mired in conflict will devolve into ethnic or tribal enclaves bent on relying on war to maintain their legitimacy and power. Aside from growing sectarianism and the increasing prevalence of failed states, an even more daunting threat come from weapons that transcend the costs of conventional warfare.

The problem of nuclear proliferation has been around for decades, and on the eve of President Trump’s inauguration, it appeared that Obama’s lofty goal of advocating for nonproliferation would no longer be a priority of American foreign policy.[3] In addition, now that the American president is threatening to undo much of the United States’ extensive network of alliances, formerly non-nuclear states may be forced to rearm themselves. Disarmament is central to liberal internationalism, as was apparent by the Washington Naval Treaty advocated by Wilson, and by the modern CTBT treaty. The reverse is, however, being seen in the modern era, with cries coming from Japan and South Korea to remobilize and begin their own nuclear weapon programs.[4] A world with more nuclear actors is a formula for chaos, especially if nuclear weapons become mass-produced. Non-state actors will increasingly eye these nuclear sites as was the case near a Belgian nuclear power plant just over a year ago.[5] If any government commits a serious misstep, access to nuclear weapons on the behalf of terrorist and insurgent groups will become a reality, especially if a civil war occurs. States with nuclear weapons require domestic stability and strong security, which is why states such as Israel, North Korea, and Pakistan could be in serious trouble in the event of a domestic uprising or military coup. The disarmament of all states is essential for human survival, and if it is not achieved, then a world full of nuclear weapons and an international system guided by realpolitik could give rise to nuclear warfare. In today’s world, nuclear weapons leave all states virtually defenseless. But, for nuclear deproliferation to become a cornerstone of the global agenda, a pacifying and democratic power must rise to the limelight to advocate the virtues of peace, stability, and human rights.

## Case

### 1NC – Top Level

#### 1] No link- the plan is domestically enforced- the mention of the WTO is just to outline what countries enact the aff

#### 2] DAs turn case- any reason why the plan is a bad idea decks credibility- even if the link is perceptions- long term perceptions are dependent on consequences

1AC Meyer. [(David Meyer is the Editor of CEO Daily and a senior writer on Fortune’s European team. Author of the digital rights primer, Control Shift: How Technology Affects You and Your Rights. “The WTO’s survival hinges on the COVID-19 vaccine patent debate, waiver advocates warn,” Fortune, June 18, 2021. <https://fortune.com/2021/06/18/wto-covid-vaccines-patents-waiver-south-africa-trips/>]

If the TRIPS waiver is successful, and people see the WTO as being part of the solution—saving lives and livelihoods—it could create goodwill and momentum to address what are still daunting structural problems."

#### 3] The WTO can’t enforce the aff- no credibility gained.

Lamp 19 [Nicholas; Assistant Professor of Law at Queen’s University; “What Just Happened at the WTO? Everything You Need to Know, Brink News,” 12/16/19; <https://www.brinknews.com/what-just-happened-at-the-wto-everything-you-need-to-know/>] Justin

Nicolas Lamp: For the first time since the establishment of the WTO in 1995, the Appellate Body cannot accept any new appeals, and that has knock-on effects on the whole global trade dispute settlement system. When a member appeals a WTO panel report, it goes to the Appellate Body, but if there is no Appellate Body, it means that that panel report will not become binding and will not attain legal force.

The absence of the Appellate Body means that members can now effectively block the dispute settlement proceedings by what has been called appealing panel reports “into the void.”

The WTO panels will continue to function as normal. When a panel issues a report, it will normally be automatically adopted — unless it is appealed. And so, even though the panel is working, the respondent in a dispute now has the option of blocking the adoption of the panel’s report. It can, thereby, shield itself from the legal consequences of a report that finds that the member has acted inconsistently with its WTO obligations.

#### 4] Their evidence proves uniqueness overwhelms the link -WTO is dead-credibility doesn’t matter when it physically can’t resolve

1AC Solís 20 [(Mireya Solís is director of the Center for East Asia Policy Studies, Philip Knight Chair in Japan Studies, and a senior fellow in the Foreign Policy program at Brookings. “The post COVID-19 world: Economic nationalism triumphant?” July 10, 2020. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2020/07/10/the-post-covid-19-world-economic-nationalism-triumphant/>] TDI

The chances that the World Trade Organization (WTO) can deliver a multilateral round of trade negotiations to slash tariffs across the board and update the trade and investment rulebook are nil. But the WTO has also lost its central role as arbiter of trade disputes among its members. In December 2019, the Appellate Body ceased to function

### **1NC- AT: Trade**

#### 1] 1AC Gonzalez doesn’t have a single warrant for solvency- hold the line

#### 2] Failure at Doha thumped all credibility- countries have given up on multilateral trade

NYT 16 Editorial Board, 1-1-2016, " Global Trade After the Failure of the Doha Round" New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/01/opinion/global-trade-after-the-failure-of-the-doha-round.html/SJKS

After 14 years of talks, members of the World Trade Organization have effectively ended the Doha round of negotiations. That was not unexpected given how fruitless these discussions have been. Now, world leaders need to think anew about the global trading system. Countries had hoped that the talks, named after the capital of Qatar, where they began in late 2001, would substantially lower trade barriers, contribute to development in poor nations and tackle difficult issues like agricultural subsidies that were not resolved in earlier pacts, like the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Failure to achieve this ambitious agenda has undermined the credibility of the multilateral trading system and hurt the least-developed countries, which are desperate to export more of their goods to richer countries. At a meeting of the W.T.O. in mid-December in Nairobi, trade ministers from more than 160 countries [failed to agree](https://www.wto.org/english/news_e/news15_e/mc10_19dec15_e.htm) that they should keep the negotiations going. In recent years, it became clear that the talks, which were originally supposed to [conclude in 2005](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/doha1_e.htm), were paralyzed because neither developed economies like the United States and the European Union nor developing countries like China and India were willing or able to make fundamental concessions. At the start of the Doha round, American and European officials committed to producing a trade agreement that would [promote development](https://www.wto.org/english/news_e/news05_e/stat_lamy_28nov05_e.htm) in poorer countries without asking them to reduce import barriers to the same extent as industrialized nations. But as developing countries, particularly China, began exporting far more than they were importing, wealthier countries started demanding that they also lower import barriers and cut subsidies to their farmers. Not surprisingly, China and India refused, insisting on sticking with the original principles. Many countries have been so frustrated by the Doha stalemate that they have been negotiating bilateral and regional trade deals. For example, the United States recently concluded the [Trans-Pacific Partnership](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/06/business/international/trans-pacific-trade-deal-tpp-vietnam-labor-rights.html?_r=0) with Japan, Vietnam and nine other countries. America and the European Union are also negotiating the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. China, which is not part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, has signed many bilateral and regional agreements and proposed a [16-country trade deal](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-trade-tpp-rcep-idUSKCN0S500220151011) that would include India and Japan.

#### 3] US China trade war killed the WTO and proves no solvency for protectionism- card is fire

- new tariffs through loopholes

- not going through dispute resolution

- not enough AB members to rule

- US concern WTO can’t solve and is risky

Bown 19 Chad Bown, 6-13-2019, "The 2018 trade war and the end of dispute settlement as we knew it," VOX Eu, https://voxeu.org/article/2018-trade-war-and-end-dispute-settlement-we-knew-it/SJKS

The US deliberately pushed the WTO to the brink Before turning to a critique of the WTO, I begin with the conventional wisdom. The US provoked a crisis in 2018 with three precisely targeted policy decisions that expertly poked holes in some of the WTO’s weakest spots. First, it imposed new tariffs – which it claimed would not be subject to international review – on nearly $50 billion of steel and aluminium imports. Formally, the US excused its new tariffs by triggering the WTO’s national security exception. The US administration has argued this exception is “self-judging” or “non-justiciable”, meaning that it cannot be questioned or benchmarked against externally verifiable economic evidence, unlike other opt-outs like antidumping or safeguards.2 But denying any outside check could lead to copycat behaviour and a protectionist spiral in which countries ignore even the most basic rules that limit tariffs. The result could be systemic failure. Second, the US retaliated against another WTO member without first going through the formal dispute resolution process. Its tariffs on $250 billion of imports from China came after completing only an internal investigation. WTO rules require a country first win a dispute that requests the partner change its policies. The US could only be authorised to retaliate if China then refused to comply, and even then, the retaliation would be subject to WTO limits. Third, the US initiated a procedure that could end the WTO’s system of resolving disputes. Countries currently have the right to appeal to the WTO’s standing Appellate Body (AB) if they disagree with a preliminary ruling. But the United States has refused to allow the appointment of new AB members as old members’ terms expire. By December 2019, the AB may not have enough members to issue rulings to appeals.3 But if no rulings are issuable, a forward-looking defendant country could simply trigger an appeal, put the legal case into permanent limbo, and eliminate the WTO’s ability to authorise tariff retaliation against countries that fail to comply. Scholars have articulated the extraordinary economic and long-run institutional costs of these and other US policy actions taken in 2017-2018.4 Those costs are of first-order importance but will not be repeated here. Instead, the next sections explore the political-economic concerns with the WTO that may have contributed to these US actions. China’s subsidies demanded US intervention of some form The US imposed national security tariffs in part because of China’s state-driven economic model. In sectors like steel and aluminium, for example, China’s expansion increased from under 20% to over 50% of global production between 2002 and 2017. Yet, even as China’s domestic demand began to slow, production and its already formidable exports continued to increase. China’s subsidies and exports exacerbated three external concerns. Its potential global domination was worrisome on anti-competitiveness grounds because of its history of abusing international market power once acquired.5 Furthermore, US policymakers have become more sensitive to the fact that technology- and trade-induced shocks impose larger-than-expected adjustment costs on domestic communities and labour markets, and that the Chinese system may push ‘its share’ of those costs onto others (Autor et al. 2016).6 Finally, China got caught in US domestic politics. Steel and aluminium firms are geographically concentrated in American swing states, and US policymakers are historically responsive to their economic interests. And the industries’ older, mostly male workers may be part of the other recent US narrative over identity politics (Grossman and Helpman 2018). US national security tariffs arose because others wouldn’t work or had been ruled illegal by the WTO Other US policy options had been taken off the table for a combination of reasons. The US had already emptied some of the WTO toolbox, but to little economic effect. Its use of antidumping tariffs had mostly stopped steel and aluminium imports directly entering from China. But China’s exports to third countries continued to rise – as did US imports from third countries – likely due to trade diversion and potentially trade deflection. But second, the US was unwilling to deploy a nondiscriminatory safeguard tariff – instead of a national security tariff – because earlier attempts had been thwarted by the WTO itself. The AB issued a series of legal rulings condemning US safeguards imposed over 1995-2003, including a 2002 US safeguard on steel.7 The US was also concerned a WTO dispute was too risky and potentially unwinnable The US ruled out a formal dispute to stop Chinese subsidies, the first-best result, out of concern that the WTO was not well-equipped to constrain Chinese-style subsidisation.8 WTO subsidy disciplines can easily capture transparent, direct payments from a government agency to firms. But Chinese subsidies are different and often stem from a nuanced and complex combination of policies. A recent OECD (2019) study of the downstream (finished) aluminium industry is illustrative. Its first key point is that primary aluminium is estimated to make up 75-86% of the cost of downstream products, and primary aluminium has benefited from highly subsidised Chinese coal. But second, China also imposed export restrictions on primary aluminium, implicitly subsidising Chinese downstream firms relative to their foreign competitors. China also rebated value-added taxes to exporters of downstream products without doing the same to primary producers. The combined result was a heavily subsidised downstream, refined aluminium industry. But it is also one that the WTO legal system would have found challenging to address.9

#### 4] 1AC Lake is ­not reverse causal and lacks solvency- no reason why trade rectifies economic competition

### 1NC- TL

#### 1] UQ overwhelms the link- 1AC Khullar is from 4 months ago- there’s no brink for escalation and COVID is only getting better

#### 2] COVID thumps escalation- 1AC Somos is before the delta variant, India has to worry about managing domestic crises not Kashmir

#### 3] Their evidence literally says its correlation not causation- means the aff doesn’t solve

1AC Somos 20 [Christy Somos is a CTVNews.ca Writer) “COVID-19 has escalated armed conflict in India, Pakistan, Iraq, Libya and the Philippines, study finds,” CTV News, December 17, 2020. <https://www.ctvnews.ca/world/covid-19-has-escalated-armed-conflict-in-india-pakistan-iraq-libya-and-the-philippines-study-finds-1.5236738>] TDI

The ongoing conflict with India saw a rise in armed conflict in Pakistan during the study period – which were unrelated to the pandemic,

### 1NC- AT: Scale Up

Also answers pandemics

#### LICs statistically cannot mass produce vaccines.

Newey et al 21 [Sarah Newey*;* Anne Gulland*;* Jennifer Rigby, (GLOBAL HEALTH SECURITY CORRESPONDENTS at the telegraph) *and* Samaan Lateef (Reporting IN INDIA) 6/1/21, Vaccinating the world: the obstacles hindering global rollout – and how to overcome them, Telegraph, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/global-health/science-and-disease/vaccinating-the-world/>] Justin

Supply is one thing but actually getting shots into arms is a huge undertaking for any country. According to a review of low and middle income countries’ readiness to implement vaccine campaigns conducted by the World Bank, 95 per cent have developed national plans and 82 per cent have worked out which groups should be vaccinated first. However, crucial gaps remain. Only 59 per cent have plans to train vaccinators and less than half (48 per cent) have implemented communications strategies to encourage people to take up vaccines. While low and middle income countries are used to delivering childhood vaccines, so have cold chain systems in place, a mass vaccine campaign for adults is a very different beast, says Mamta Murthi, vice president for human development at the World Bank. “This is a very different population – adults may be at work, at home, they may be unwilling to travel or not be able to come to vaccine centres,” she says.

#### The aff ignores insufficient infrastructure, materials, and “know how” needed to expand vaccine supply- even if IPR were waived there’s no scale up

Santos Rutschman 21 Santos Rutschman, Ana (Professor of Law, St. Louis University) and Julia Barnes-Weise (Executive Director of the Global Healthcare Innovation Alliances Accelerator a non-profit organization spun out of a program in Public Policy at Duke University, and a Senior Consultant to the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations. She is a lawyer, global health policy consultant, entrepreneur and Certified Licensing Professional). "The COVID-19 Vaccine Patent Waiver: The Wrong Tool for the Right Goal." Bill of Health (2021) (2021)./SJKS

Second, even if all types of legal restrictions on the use of vaccine technology were lifted — or had never existed in the first place — there is simply not enough infrastructure (manufacturing facilities and equipment) nor raw materials (the components needed to manufacture and deliver vaccines) to produce and distribute COVID-19 vaccines as predicted under current waiver proposals. We have long faced a global vaccine manufacturing problem that will not be fully resolved during the current pandemic. In the case of vaccines that need to be kept at ultra-cold temperatures, these problems intensify. One of us (Barnes-Weise) has been involved in the contractual negotiations for the development, manufacturing and transfer of technology related to COVID-19 vaccines. In addition to the informational gaps described above, COVID-19 vaccine manufacturers are most concerned about how well the recipients of the technology transfer will understand and be able to implement such knowledge in making vaccines of the necessary quality. Shortages do not merely affect materials necessary to manufacture vaccines and facilities adequate to manufacture the vaccines; they also affect the availability of personnel qualified to instruct the licensee and recipient of this information. Sending an employee of this caliber out of the original manufacturing site to a partner site risks reducing the capacity of the first site. And remote instruction, necessitated by the pandemic, has its own shortcomings. In relation to the patents on the vaccines themselves, most of the concerns that the vaccine manufacturers express are around the protection of their vaccine platforms for the purposes of making future or non-COVID-19 vaccines. Moderna shared information about its [patents](https://www.modernatx.com/patents) in summer 2020. The manufacturers, as evidenced by the number of licenses to manufacture granted to date, are eager to [find](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-lonza-moderna/lonza-gets-licence-to-make-ingredients-for-moderna-vaccine-idUSKBN2B72BB) [partners](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-01-27/sanofi-to-make-millions-of-biontech-pfizer-s-covid-vaccine-doses) with the [capabilities](https://www.fosunpharma.com/en/news/news-details-3801.html) to expand production. It is not to their benefit to produce an inadequate supply of a highly sought-after vaccine. However, even willingness to transfer patented vaccine technology has faced numerous practical hurdles to date: 1) infrastructural limitations; 2) scarcity of raw materials; 3) concerns about licensees having the ability to actually manufacture effective vaccines in light of the infrastructural and product scarcity, even in situations in which there might be no informational gaps. A patent waiver would not address any of the practical concerns currently at the root of tech transfer negotiations involving COVID-19 vaccine technology. Compounding these problems is the fact that, should a waiver be issued, there is no legal mechanism that can compel the transfer of certain types of know-how or trade secrets should a company be unwilling to license its intellectual property — which, again, at this point in the pandemic, is not a problem we have observed. Finally, it is important to keep in mind that a waiver would be temporary: supporters of current waiver proposals should consider what will happen once demand for vaccines begins diminishing and fewer manufacturers remain on the market. Moreover, they should consider the legal and practical uncertainty that a waiver would introduce, as it is unclear how technology transfer between companies would cease (or continue) once the waiver expires.

#### The aff doesn’t scale up fast enough to solve covid and distracts us from the root cause – prefer statistics.

Taylor 21 [Andrea; Andrea leads a portfolio of global innovation programs focused on evaluation, scaling, and adaptation of healthcare innovations to address critical access and quality challenges. Her work with the Duke Global Health Innovation Center and Innovations in Healthcare drive evidence-based recommendations for scaling transformative models of care, adapting models into new contexts, and facilitating system change. She is the research lead for the Launch and Scale project’s COVID-19 workstream, analyzing global data on vaccines, partnerships, and therapeutics to combat the pandemic. She led design and research for the USAID-funded Social Entrepreneurship Accelerator at Duke (SEAD) and the development of several publications for the recent evaluation of the Saving Lives at Birth program, with USAID and GCC. Before joining Duke University in 2012, Andrea was on faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Social Work, where she conducted research on health and economic policy innovation. Prior to this, she worked for the US Department of Health and Human Services, where she co-designed programs to build capacity for mental health policy and care delivery in countries coming out of violent conflict. She holds a master’s degree in Social Service Administration (social work) from the University of Chicago; “CAN THE TRIPS WAIVER SAVE THE WORLD? WEEKLY COVID VACCINE RESEARCH UPDATE,” Duke; 5/7/21; <https://dukeghic.org/2021/05/07/can-the-trips-waiver-save-the-world/>] Justin

We are not optimizing the capacity we already have

Calls for the TRIPS waiver are based on the assumption that IP is holding up global production. Our review of the evidence, however, does not support this.

Our data on vaccine manufacturing show that most Covid-19 vaccines using traditional platforms, such as viral vector and inactivated virus, did use tech transfer deals to set up global manufacturing networks. AstraZeneca has agreements in place to manufacture Covid-19 vaccine in 16 countries, Novavax and Sputnik V in 11 countries, Sinovac in 6 countries. But many of these manufacturing partners (particularly those in middle-income countries) are delayed in starting or operating at only partial capacity because knowledge transfer is difficult and raw materials are in short supply.

For mRNA vaccines, like Moderna and Pfizer-BioNTech, the picture is even more complicated. Very few manufacturers (and none in LMICs) are equipped to manufacture mRNA vaccine, with or without access to intellectual property.

Setting up manufacturing takes longer than we think

Starting from scratch to set up new manufacturing through access to IP is not an immediate fix. And right now, we need to be focused on an immediate fix. Retrofitting or building new plants takes a long time. Running test batches, quality checks, audits and regulatory approval of manufacturing sites also takes a long time. Starting that process now is not likely to produce more doses this year, when they are most needed.

The capacity gap is more than IP

Patents and written trade secrets alone do not provide the information, expertise, or equipment needed to produce vaccines. It would be significantly more difficult to force the sharing of specialized expertise required to apply the information. Without investment in knowledge exchange and skill development, as well as physical equipment, the intellectual property in written form cannot cover the capacity gap. To succeed, any waiver of IP must be embedded within a larger transfer of know-how and infrastructure development, which is unlikely without bringing pharmaceutical companies along as willing partners.

The world is on fire

When the pharma industry says the waiver will “undermine our global response to the pandemic,” most of us can agree that yes, that is precisely the point. Our analysis of vaccine data indicate that response has not been particularly successful and a pivot is certainly indicated.

But it is the next six months that are most critical. Right now, the immediate need is to increase the production of equipment and raw materials needed to fuel existing technology transfer deals so that manufacturers who have already spent months learning the recipes and gaining the expertise can get to work.

There is a real risk that this discussion about patents and IP is distracting us from focusing on the crisis at hand. We are essentially arguing over who is allowed to make fire engines while we watch the world burn. Right now, we need to make sure we can get water flowing through every hose we have.

#### The aff causes a scramble for limited resources by manufacturers with no experience – turns case.

Breuninger 21 [Kevin; Specialist at CNBC; “Pfizer CEO opposes U.S. call to waive Covid vaccine patents, cites manufacturing and safety issues,” CNBC; 5/7/21; <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/05/07/pfizer-ceo-biden-backed-covid-vaccine-patent-waiver-will-cause-problems.html>] Justin

“Currently, infrastructure is not the bottleneck for us manufacturing faster,” Bourla wrote in a dear colleague letter posted on LinkedIn. “The restriction is the scarcity of highly specialized raw materials needed to produce our vaccine.”

Pfizer’s vaccine requires 280 different materials and components that are sourced from 19 countries around the world, Bourla said. He contended that without patent protections, entities with much less experienced than Pfizer at manufacturing vaccines will start competing for the same ingredients.

“Right now, virtually every single gram of raw material produced is shipped immediately into our manufacturing facilities and is converted immediately and reliably to vaccines that are shipped immediately around the world,” Bourla wrote.

He predicted that the proposed waiver “threatens to disrupt the flow of raw materials.”

“It will unleash a scramble for the critical inputs we require in order to make a safe and effective vaccine,” Bourla wrote.

“Entities with little or no experience in manufacturing vaccines are likely to chase the very raw materials we require to scale our production, putting the safety and security of all at risk,” the CEO wrote.

#### Prevents distribution---causes vaccine hesitancy.

Newey et al 21 [Sarah Newey*;* Anne Gulland*;* Jennifer Rigby, (GLOBAL HEALTH SECURITY CORRESPONDENTS at the telegraph) *and* Samaan Lateef (Reporting IN INDIA) 6/1/21, Vaccinating the world: the obstacles hindering global rollout – and how to overcome them, Telegraph, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/global-health/science-and-disease/vaccinating-the-world/>] Justin

[Vaccine hesitancy has also reared its head](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/global-health/science-and-disease/hesitancy-hard-wired-us-indulge-now-peril/), with concerns around rare blood clots linked to the AstraZeneca and J&J vaccines hitting public confidence in Africa. The Democratic Republic of Congo sent 1.3m unwanted doses to countries including Togo and Senegal before they expired in late June, while Malawi destroyed 20,000 unused shots last month as hesitancy hit rollout. “There were some assumptions in the public health community that this is such a bad pandemic... that this will change people’s minds if they were ever hesitant about vaccines,” Prof Heidi Larson, director of the Vaccine Confidence Project, told a Devex event. “Well, it hasn’t really – in fact, the groups and the questioning around vaccines and some of the anti sentiments have actually escalated.” There are also growing concerns that the AstraZeneca and J&J vaccines may be viewed as the “cheap relation” compared to the new mRNA vaccines produced by Pfizer and Moderna. Given the former make up the bulk of Covax’s supply and are far easier to distribute in the developing world, this is a substantial hurdle. “The AstraZeneca row has significantly impacted confidence – not just across Africa, but around the world,” says Dr Ayoade Alakija, co-chair of the Africa Union Vaccine Delivery Alliance. “But there is no choice here [to pick a different vaccine].” However, back in Kumasi, Mr Nyarko says it is supply rather than confidence that is currently undermining his district’s roll out. And with no clear picture on when more shots will arrive, he’s left with few options. “All we can do for now is pray that Ghana can secure another batch,” he says. “We are praying that the UK and Europe will help us.

### 1NC- AT: Impact

#### 1] NO WAR BECAUSE OF ECON DECLINE: 3 warrants

#### Cheap talk solves.

Carter 18 Erin Baggott Carter, International Relations Professor at the University of Southern California. [Diversionary Cheap Talk: Unemployment and US Foreign Policy Rhetoric, 1945-2010, http://www.erinbcarter.org/documents/diversionUS.pdf]//BPS

5 Conclusion This study shows that when economic conditions deteriorate, American presidents consolidate domestic support by criticizing other countries. By cueing national identity and highlighting differences between nations, they elicit an ingroup rally that boosts their popularity. Poll data show that citizens evaluate leaders more highly after they engage in hostile for¬eign policy rhetoric and economic data show that leaders are more likely to engage in that rhetoric when unemployment (or the misery index) is higher. Further strengthening the no¬tion that this behavior is strategic, leaders target traditional adversaries for hostile foreign policy rhetoric, since threatening outgroups render intergroup distinctions most stark. I find no evidence for diversion in the form of material dispute initiation. For leaders choosing between hostile rhetoric, economic reform, and international conflict to increase domestic popularity, hostile rhetoric is the least costly and risky option, even though it is a short term solution because sustained bluster invites the criticism of party elites. For American presidents, cheap talk pays. Future research should focus on three areas. First, citizens have multiple political al¬legiances. The political communication literature suggests that the media is an important intermediary between elites and citizens. For example, rallies are smaller when there is elite debate surrounding a presidential action. While this study finds that presidents are able to generate rallies with rhetoric and that rallies are mediated by citizen partisanship, further research might focus on how sub- and superordinate group membership affects the accep¬tance of political cues from leaders in a more complex—perhaps experimental—framework. Second, there is little research on political rhetoric in less representative countries. Diversionary cheap talk is not particular to America: Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hugo Chavez 10 won massive popularity through their anti-Americanism, for instance. Chinese policymak¬ers bluster about the South China Sea to increase their domestic legitimacy. Scholars have devoted relatively little attention to rhetoric in international politics due, in part, to scarce data. The American Diplomacy Dataset helps address that paucity. While verbal and material behavior are theoretically and empirically distinct, they are sometimes substitutes, and the rhetorical aspects of international politics remain under-theorized and under-explored.

#### 2] No IndoPak WAR: 1AC Howell isn’t specific to IndoPak- prefer our evidence on specificity

#### India’s NFU and Pakistan has no incentive- is emprically proven

**Herrera 19**, Jack. “Could the Conflict Between Pakistan and India Lead to Nuclear War?” Pacific Standard, 27 Feb. 2019, psmag.com/news/could-the-conflict-between-pakistan-and-india-lead-to-nuclear-war. SJCP//JG

Does that mean the current conflict between Pakistan and India could escalate into a nuclear confrontation? Commentators regard that possibility as unlikely. Pakistan first began developing nuclear weapons in response to its humiliating loss of territory in 1971. Thus far, the current conflict with India does not appear to be a land grab, which suggests Pakistan does not have reason to engage its nuclear option. "To be clear, escalating tensions to the point of nuclear conflict would be catastrophic for both India and Pakistan and would destabilize the entire region—an option unlikely to be taken by either New Delhi or Islamabad," Saheli Roy Choudhury wrote for [CNBC](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/02/27/india-pakistan-air-strike-claims-what-you-need-to-know.html) on Wednesday. History bolsters Choudhury's analysis. In 1999, Pakistan and India became the first nuclear powers ever to engage in direct war with each others' forces. On the ice of the Kargil Glacier, nestled nine miles above sea level between Himalayan peaks, Pakistani soldiers, initially disguised as a Kashmiri militants, exchanged fire with Indian soldiers. The high-altitude fighting only lasted two months before the two sides agreed to de-escalate.

#### South Asian deterrence is stable – mutually assured destruction is uniquely true

Ladwig 15 – Walter C. Ladwig III, Lecturer in International Relations at King's College London, Ph.D. in International Relations from Merton College, Oxford, 2015 (“Indian Military Modernization and Conventional Deterrence in South Asia,” *Journal of Strategic Studies*, May 11th, Taylor & Francis Online)

Headline grabbing increases in the Indian defense budget and a high-profile military modernization program have alarmed observers who worry that these developments could undermine the conventional military balance credited with maintaining ‘ugly stability’ in South Asia. While on their face these concerns have validity, upon deeper examination, there is still good reason to continue to be optimistic about the prospects for conventional deterrence. India’s defense procurement continues to under perform, producing far less in terms of military power than its spending would suggest. Conversely, Pakistan –assisted by China and others –has prevented the emergence of sharp asymmetries in the conventional military balance and even narrowed previously existing gaps. Modernizing or not, the Indian military is capable of bringing far less force to bear in a limited conflict with Pakistan than the pessimists realize. As a result, it is unlikely that Indian policymakers would conclude that they can either achieve strategic surprise against Pakistan or carry out highly-effective air strikes with little escalatory risk, each of which is a necessary condition for deterrence failure. Consequently, Pakistan’s justification for its current efforts to develop tactical nuclear weapons and delivery systems on security grounds lacks a firm foundation. These systems only increase the likelihood of an inadvertent nuclear exchange, while adding little to the deterrence value of Pakistan’s force posture. There may be a variety of reasons why Islamabad is expanding and diversifying its nuclear arsenal, but a rational response to the threat posed by India’s on-going military modernization is not one of them.140

### 1NC – AT: Disease

#### No extinction from disease – burnout and variation checks

York ‘14 (Ian, head of the Influenza Molecular Virology and Vaccines team in the Immunology and Pathogenesis Branch of the Influenza Division at the CDC, PhD in Molecular Virology and Immunology from McMaster University, M.Sc. in Veterinary Microbiology and Immunology from the University of Guelph, former Assistant Prof of Microbiology & Molecular Genetics at Michigan State, “Why Don't Diseases Completely Wipe Out Species?” 6/4/2014, http://www.quora.com/Why-dont-diseases-completely-wipe-out-species)

But mostly diseases don't drive species extinct. There are several reasons for that. For one, the most dangerous diseases are those that spread from one individual to another. If the disease is highly lethal, then the population drops, and it becomes less likely that individuals will contact each other