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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.

#### It applies to “medicines” – 1] upward entailment test – “member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines” doesn’t entail that member nations of the WTO ought to reduce IPP for drugs because it doesn’t prove that marijuana protections should be reduced 2] adverb test – adding “always” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning because reduce is permanent.

#### Violation: They spec COVID-19 medicines

#### 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 to HIV drugs to Insulin— 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.

#### 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

## 2

#### 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.

#### Morality must be grounded in a priori truth to guide action, otherwise everyone would have different ethical codes and follow different rules. And, truth exists independent of human experience since certain things can be self-proving, i.e. a triangle has three sides. This is the difference between a priori and a posteriori. Things that are true by observation are just true by a matter of chance. For example, the cat may be on the mat, but we can also conceive of a world in which the cat is not on the mat. In contrast, we can’t conceive of a world in which a triangle does not have three sides since it is tautologically true. Reject a posteriori truth since they are just arbitrary states of being, not constitutive of ethics.

#### And, a priori truth has to apply to everyone: [a] absent universal ethics, morality becomes arbitrary and fails to guide action, which means that ethics is rendered useless. [b] it’s a tautological contradiction: any non-universal norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends, which also means universalizability acts as a side constraint on all other frameworks.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with willing universal maxims.

#### 1] Intellectual property is an inalienable personal right of economic use

**Pozzo 6** Pozzo, Riccardo. “Immanuel Kant on Intellectual Property.” Trans/Form/Ação, vol. 29, no. 2, 2006, pp. 11–18., doi:10.1590/s0101-31732006000200002. SJ//DA recut SJKS recut Cookie JX

Corpus mysticum, opus mysticum, propriété incorporelle, proprietà letteraria, geistiges Eigentum. All these terms mean **intellectual property, the existence of which is intuitively clear because of the unbreakable bond that ties the work to its creator.** The book belongs to whomever has written it, the picture to whomever has painted it, the sculpture to whomever has sculpted it; and this independently from the number of exemplars of the book or of the work of art in their passages from owner to owner. The initial bond cannot change and it ensures the author authority on the work. Kant writes in section 31/II of the Metaphysics of Morals: “Why does unauthorized publishing, which strikes one even at first glance as unjust, still have an appearance of being rightful? Because on the one hand a book is a corporeal artifact (opus mechanicum) that can be reproduced (by someone in legitimate possession of a copy of it), so that there is a right to a thing with regard to it. On the other hand a book is also a mere discourse of the publisher to the public, which the publisher may not repeat publicly without having a mandate from the author to do so (praestatio operae), and this is a right against a person. The error consists in mistaking one of these rights for the other” (Kant, 1902, t.6, p.290). The corpus mysticum, **the work considered as an immaterial good, remains property of the author on behalf of the original right of its creation. The corpus mechanicum consists of the exemplars of the book or of the work of art. It becomes the property of whoever has bought the material object in which the work has been reproduced or expressed.** Seneca points out in De beneficiis (VII, 6) the difference between owning a thing and owning its use. He tells us that the bookseller Dorus had the habit of calling Cicero’s books his own, while there are people who claim books their own because they have written them and other people that do the same because they have bought them. Seneca concludes that the books can be correctly said to belong to both, for it is true they belong to both, but in a different way **The peculiarity of intellectual property consists thus first in being indeed a property, but property of an action; and second in being indeed inalienable, but also transferable in commission and license to a publisher. The bond the author has on his work confers him a moral right that is indeed a personal right. It is also a right to exploit economically his work in all possible ways, a right of economic use, which is a patrimonial right. Kant and Fichte argued that moral right and the right of economic use are strictly connected, and that the offense to one implies inevitably offense to the other.** In eighteenth-century Germany, the free use came into discussion among the presuppositions of a democratic renewal of state and society. In his Supplement to the Consideration of Publishing and Its Rights, Reimarus asked writers “instead of writing for the aristocracy, to write for the tiers état of the reader’s world.” (Reimarus, 1791b, p.595). **He saluted with enthusiasm the claim of disenfranchising from the monopoly of English publishers expressed in the American Act for the Encouragement of Learning of May 31, 1790. Kant, however, was firm in embracing intellectual property. Referring himself to Roman Law, he asked for its legislative formulation not only as patrimonial right, but also as a personal right.** In Of the Illegitimity of Pirate Publishing, he considered the moral faculties related to **intellectual property as an “inalienable right (ius personalissimum) always himself to speak through anyone else, the right, that is, that no one may deliver the same speech to the public other than in his (the author’s) name”** (Kant, 1902, t.8, p.85). Fichte went farther in the Demonstration of the Illegitimity of Pirate Publishing. **He saw intellectual property as a part of his metaphysical construction of intellectual activity, which was based on the principle that thoughts “are not transmitted hand to hand, they are not paid with shining cash, neither are they transmitted to us if we take home the book that contains them and put it into our library.** In order to make those thoughts our own an action is still missing: we must read the book, meditate – provided it is not completely trivial – on its content, consider it under different aspects and eventually accept it within our connections of ideas” (Fichte, 1964, t.I/1, p.411). At the center of the discussion was the practice of reprinting books in a pirate edition after having them reset word after words after an exemplar of the original edition. Given Germany’s division in a myriad of small states, the imperial privilege was ineffective against pirate publishing. Kant and Fichte spoke for the acceptance of the right to defend the work of an author by the usurpations of others so that he may receive a patrimonial advantage from those who utilize the work acquiring new knowledge and/or an aesthetic experience. In particular, Fichte declared the absolute primacy of the moral faculties within the corpus mysticum. He divided the latter into a formal and a material part. “This intellectual element must be divided anew into what is material, the content of the book, the thoughts it presents; and the form of these thoughts, the manner in which, the connection in which, the formulations and the words by means of which the book presents them” (Fichte, 1964, t.I/1, p.411). Fichte’s underlining the author’s exclusive right to the intellectual content of his book – “the appropriation of which through another is physically impossible” (ibid.) – brought him to the extreme of prohibiting any form of copy that is not meant for personal use. In Publishing Considered anew, Reimarus considered on the contrary copyright in its patrimonial aspects as a limitation to free trade: “What would not happen were a universal protection against pirate publishing guaranteed? Monopoly and safer sales certainly do not procure convenient price; on the contrary, they are at the origin of great abuses. The only condition for convenient price is free-trade, and one cannot help noticing that upon the appearance of a private edition, publishers are forced to substantially lower the price of a book” (Reimarus, 1791a, pp.402-3). Reimarus admitted of being unable to argue in terms of justice. Justice was of no bearing, he said, for whom, like himself, considered undemonstrated the author’s permanent property of his work (herein supported by the legislative vacuum of those years). What mattered, he said, was equity. In sum, Reimarus anticipated today’s stance on free use by referring to the principle that public interest on knowledge ought to prevail on the author’s interest and to balance the copyright. Moreover, Reimarus extended his argument beyond the realm of literary production to embrace, among others, the today vital issue of pharmaceutical production on patented receipts. “Let us suppose that at some place a detailed description for the preparation of a good medicine or of any other useful thing be published, why may not somebody who lives in places that are far away from that one copy it to use it for his own profit and but must instead ask the original publisher for the issue of each exemplar?” (Reimarus, 1791b, t.2, pp.584). To sum up, Reimarus’s stance does not seem respondent to rule of law. For in all dubious case the general rule ought to prevail, fighting intellectual property with anti-monopolistic arguments in favor of free trade brings with itself consequences that are not tranquilizing also for the ones that are expected to apply the law. **By resetting literary texts, one could obviously expurgate some errors. More frequently, however, some were added, given the exclusively commercial objectives of the reprints. The valid principle was, thus, that reprints were less precise than original editions, but they were much cheaper for the simple reason that the pirate publisher had a merely moral obligation against the author and the original publisher. In fact, he was not held to pay any honorarium to the author upon handling over the manuscript, nor to paying him royalties, nor to pay anything to the original publisher. The** only expense in charge of the pirate publisher was buying the exemplar of the original edition out of which he was to make, as we say today, a free use.

#### 2]The aff encourages free riding- that treats people as ­means to an end and takes advantage of their efforts which violates the principle of humanity

**Van Dyke 2** 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

Also, **allowing the free taking of ideas, content and valuable data, i.e., the fruits of individual intellectual endeavor**, would disrupt capitalism in a radical way. **The resulting more secretive approach in support of the above free-riding Statement** would be akin to a Communist environment **where the State owned everything and the citizen owned nothing, i.e., the people “consented” to this. It is, accordingly, manifestly clear that no reasonable and supportable Categorical Imperative can be made for the unwarranted theft of property, whether tangible or intangible,** apart from legitimate exigencies.

#### IPs are a necessary check on companies free-riding off associations of quality.

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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#### We are on pace to cut emissions by half in 2030 and prevent 2 degree tipping point, but continued biotech innovation is key

**Mcmurry-Health 5-21** Michelle Mcmurry-Heath May 21, 2021, 5-21-2021, "To help solve climate change, look to the biosciences," STAT, <https://www.statnews.com/2021/05/21/climate-change-solutions-from-biosciences/> //Nato

President Biden’s pledge to cut U.S. greenhouse gas emissions in half by 2030 is an admirable and ambitious undertaking. It’s nearly double the goal set by President Obama in 2015. And it establishes the United States as a world leader in battling climate change. But reaching the president’s target in just under 10 years is a monumental task. It’s so big, in fact, that we’ll never get there by government action alone. No amount of vehicle efficiency standards, forest conservation efforts, or gas taxes can [fully solve the problem](https://www.rff.org/publications/issue-briefs/emissions-projections-for-a-trio-of-federal-climate-policies/). We have to science our way out of it. The biosciences, including biotechnology, will play a pivotal role in the fight against climate change. It is already leading the way on several fronts. According to a [report from BIO](https://www.bio.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/Climate%20Report%20Executive%20Summary_FINAL.pdf), the organization I work for, the biotech industry’s green initiatives could mitigate the equivalent of 3 billion tons of carbon dioxide every year by 2030, or [about half](https://www.eia.gov/environment/emissions/carbon/#:~:text=Energy%E2%80%90related%20CO2%20emissions%20in,economy%20declined%204.9%25%20in%202019.) of the country’s annual CO2 emissions. Take food, for example. Food consumption — and production — is central to human existence. Global food production accounts for [one-quarter of greenhouse gas emissions](https://ourworldindata.org/food-ghg-emissions). A recent report from an international team of researchers concluded that even if all other fossil fuel emissions were eliminated, [emissions from food production alone](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/370/6517/705) would prevent us from reaching a key goal of the climate change agreement signed in Paris: preventing the global temperature from [rising more than 2 degrees Celsius](https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement). Halting food production isn’t an option, so biotech companies are helping farmers become part of the climate solution. Take, for example, Boston-based [Joyn Bio](https://joynbio.com/). It is engineering bacteria that pull nitrogen directly from the atmosphere. These microbes then pass the nitrogen to crops like wheat and corn, reducing the need to make, transport, and apply nitrogen fertilizers, which reduces greenhouse gas emissions. Minnesota-based Acceligen is using a technique it calls [precision breeding](https://www.acceligen.com/precision-breeding/) that improves the health of livestock while reducing their waste, greenhouse gas emissions, and water usage. Biotechnology can also help protect food from climate change. As fungal and bacterial infections accelerated by [human-driven environmental disturbances](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41579-019-0222-5) threaten to wipe out Cavendish bananas, [Tropic Biosciences](https://www.tropicbioscience.com/) in the United Kingdom is using CRISPR gene-editing technology to engineer infection-resistant bananas. Companies are also rethinking how food is packaged to reduce plastic pollution and open high-tech paths to broader adoption of biodegradables. This would be a game-changer in the interlinked fight to modulate climate change and protect the oceans. Globally, [100 million tons](https://www.wwf.org.au/news/blogs/plastic-waste-and-climate-change-whats-the-connection#gs.0r1uqu) of plastic are produced every year, [8 million of which ends up in the oceans](https://www.wwf.org.au/news/blogs/plastic-waste-and-climate-change-whats-the-connection#gs.0r1uqu). The production of plastic requires at least 8% of the world’s petroleum. Greenhouse gas emissions from plastic production and incineration [could rise](https://www.wwf.org.au/news/blogs/plastic-waste-and-climate-change-whats-the-connection#gs.0r1uqu) from the current 850 million tons a year to 3 billion tons a year by 2050. And discarded plastic that ends up in the ocean slowly breaks down in sunlight, releasing greenhouse gases and toxic microplastics. Georgia-based [Danimer Scientific](https://danimerscientific.com/) — partnering with the Mars Wrigley candy company — is working on biodegradable packaging that uses plant oils to manufacture “plastic” that dissolves in soil and water. Bioplastics and biopolymers can reduce greenhouse gas emissions reductions by up to [80%](https://www.bio.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/Climate%20Report%20Executive%20Summary_FINAL.pdf) more compared to their petroleum-based counterparts. Fuel is another target for biotechnology. Transportation accounts for the [highest percentage](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/sources-greenhouse-gas-emissions) of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. While electric cars are gaining popularity, and the $174 billion allocated to support the transition to electrics in Biden’s American Jobs Plan is important, biofuels — which are [carbon neutral](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-4-431-54895-9_6#:~:text=of%20climate%20change.-,Biofuels%20can%20reduce%20the%20consumption%20of%20fossil%20fuels%20and%20thus,because%20biofuels%20are%20carbon%20neutral.&text=The%20production%20of%20a%20biofuel,material%20for%20making%20liquid%20fuel.) — will be needed to help reduce emissions in transportation and need comparable support. The biotech company [Synthetic Genomics](https://syntheticgenomics.com/algal-cell-factories/#beyond_biofuels), for instance, is utilizing saltwater algae, which convert sunlight and carbon dioxide into biomass, to make sustainable auto fuel. By 2025, 10,000 barrels of the algal biofuel could be produced per day for commercial use. Biofuels will also play an important role in air travel. While flying accounts for less than [3% of global CO2 emissions](https://ourworldindata.org/co2-emissions-from-aviation) a year, on a per-mile calculation it’s the least green form of travel. With the number of air travel passengers expected to double by 2040, the Biden administration is upping the financial incentives — through tax credits — for companies that produce sustainable aircraft fuels. Biotech firms are already stepping up. Companies like [Neste](https://www.neste.us/neste-in-north-america), [Gevo](https://gevo.com/), and [World Energy](https://www.worldenergy.net/products/sustainable-aviation-fuel-saf/) are using everything from algae to used or wasted cooking oil to create sustainable jet fuels. [LanzaTech](https://www.lanzatech.com/) recycles carbon from industrial emissions and other sources and turns it into aviation fuel — and has recently [partnered with other corporations](https://techcrunch.com/2020/06/02/lanzajet-launches-to-make-renewable-jet-fuel-a-reality/) to bring that fuel to market for commercial airline use. With help from biotechnology, the U.S. can achieve the climate change goals outlined by the Biden administration and the Paris Agreement. Human progress and technology got us into this mess. That same ingenuity can help get us out.

#### The aff sets the precedent that IP can be waived to solve global problems. That stunts innovation in Climate Change tech

**Brand 5-6** Melissa Brand, 5-26-2021, "TRIPS IP Waiver Could Establish Dangerous Precedent for Climate Change and Other Biotech Sectors," IPWatchdog, <https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/26/trips-ip-waiver-establish-dangerous-precedent-climate-change-biotech-sectors/id=133964/> //Nato

While the discussions around waiving intellectual property (IP) rights set forth in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) are currently (and somewhat amorphously) limited to COVID-19 related drug and medical products, it is probably shortsighted to ignore the implications for other technologies critical to sustaining our environment and advancing a more healthful world. In fact, if we want to ensure continued investment in these technologies, we should be very concerned about the message conveyed by the international political tide: if you overcome a challenging scientific problem and your solution has the potential to save lives, be prepared to be subjected to intense political pressure and to potentially hand over your technology without compensation and regardless of the consequences. The biotech industry is making remarkable advances towards climate change solutions, and it is precisely for this reason that it can expect to be in the crosshairs of potential IP waiver discussions. President Biden is correct to refer to climate change as an existential crisis. Yet it does not take too much effort to connect the dots between President Biden’s focus on climate change and his Administration’s recent commitment to waive global IP rights for Covid vaccines (TRIPS IP Waiver). “This is a global health crisis, and the extraordinary circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures.” If an IP waiver is purportedly necessary to solve the COVID-19 global health crisis (and of course [we dispute this notion](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/04/19/waiving-ip-rights-during-times-of-covid-a-false-good-idea/id=132399/)), can we really feel confident that this or some future Administration will not apply the same logic to the climate crisis? And, without the confidence in the underlying IP for such solutions, what does this mean for U.S. innovation and economic growth? United States Trade Representative (USTR) [Katherine Tai](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/05/tai-says-united-states-will-back-india-southafrica-proposal-waive-ip-rights-trips/id=133224/) was subject to questioning along this very line during a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing. And while Ambassador Tai did not affirmatively state that an IP waiver would be in the future for climate change technology, she surely did not assuage the concerns of interested parties. International Pressure May Be Influencing Domestic IP Policy The United States has historically supported robust IP protection. This support is one reason the United States is the center of biotechnology innovation and leading the fight against COVID-19. However, a brief review of the domestic legislation arguably most relevant to this discussion shows just how far the international campaign against IP rights has eroded our normative position. The Clean Air Act, for example, contains a provision allowing for the mandatory licensing of patents covering certain devices for reducing air pollution. Importantly, however, the patent owner is accorded due process and the statute lays out a detailed process regulating the manner in which any such license can be issued, including findings of necessity and that no reasonable alternative method to accomplish the legislated goal exists. Also of critical importance is that the statute requires compensation to the patent holder. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Act contemplates mandatory licensing of patents covering inventions of primary importance in producing or utilizing atomic energy. This statute, too, requires due process, findings of importance to the statutory goals and compensation to the rights holder. A TRIPS IP waiver would operate outside of these types of frameworks. There would be no due process, no particularized findings, no compensation and no recourse. Indeed, the fact that the World Trade Organization (WTO) already has a process under the TRIPS agreement to address public health crises, including the compulsory licensing provisions, with necessary guardrails and compensation, makes quite clear that the waiver would operate as a free for all. Forced Tech Transfer Could Be on The Table When being questioned about the scope of a potential TRIPS IP waiver, Ambassador Tai invoked the proverb “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” While this answer suggests primarily that, in times of famine, the Administration would rather give away other people’s fishing rods than share its own plentiful supply of fish (here: actual COVID-19 vaccine stocks), it is apparent that in Ambassador Tai’s view waiving patent rights alone would not help lower- and middle-income countries produce their own vaccines. Rather, they would need to be taught how to make the vaccines and given the biotech industry’s manufacturing know-how, sensitive cell lines, and proprietary cell culture media in order to do so. In other words, Ambassador Tai acknowledged that the scope of the current TRIPS IP waiver discussions includes the concept of forced tech transfer. In the context of climate change, the idea would be that companies who develop successful methods for producing new seed technologies and sustainable biomass, reducing greenhouse gases in manufacturing and transportation, capturing and sequestering carbon in soil and products, and more, would be required to turn over their proprietary know-how to global competitors. While it is unclear how this concept would work in practice and under the constitutions of certain countries, the suggestion alone could be devastating to voluntary international collaborations. Even if one could assume that the United States could not implement forced tech transfer on its own soil, what about the governments of our international development partners? It is not hard to understand that a U.S.-based company developing climate change technologies would be unenthusiastic about partnering with a company abroad knowing that the foreign country’s government is on track – with the assent of the U.S. government – to change its laws and seize proprietary materials and know-how that had been voluntarily transferred to the local company. Necessary Investment Could Diminish Developing climate change solutions is not an easy endeavor and bad policy positions threaten the likelihood that they will materialize. These products have long lead times from research and development to market introduction, owing not only to a high rate of failure but also rigorous regulatory oversight. Significant investment is required to sustain and drive these challenging and long-enduring endeavors. For example, synthetic biology companies critical to this area of innovation [raised over $1 billion in investment in the second quarter of 2019 alone](https://www.bio.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/Climate%20Report_FINAL.pdf). If investors cannot be confident that IP will be in place to protect important climate change technologies after their long road from bench to market, it is unlikely they will continue to invest at the current and required levels. Next on the Chopping Block It is quite reasonable to be worried about the broad implications of a TRIPS IP waiver precedent. International campaigns to weaken IP rights seem to be taking hold in U.S. domestic policy. The TRIPS IP waiver discussions will not conclude in the near term and will not yield more shots in people’s arms. This is not even truly disputed, as our own administration acknowledges that the goal here is technology transfer abroad. Given the signaling that our Administration believes waiving IP rights is an appropriate measure to end global crises, it is proper to worry that facets of the biotech sector addressing climate change may be next on the chopping block.

#### Climate change destroys the world.

Specktor 19 [Brandon; writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years; "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, 6/4/19; <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html>] Justin

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes**; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of** [**lethal heat conditions**](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly **one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert**. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations**, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in **nuclear war, are likely**. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

#### Disad turns the case. Climate change increases the rate of disease outbreaks.

**Lustgarten 5/7** Abrahm Lustgarten (environmental reporter, with a focus at the intersection of business, climate and energy. He is currently covering changes at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and working on a project about pollution at U.S. Defense sites). 5/7/2020, How Climate Change Is Contributing to Skyrocketing Rates of Infectious Disease, Propublica, <https://www.propublica.org/article/climate-infectious-diseases> //Nato

The scientists who study how diseases emerge in a changing environment knew this moment was coming. Climate change is making outbreaks of disease more common and more dangerous. Over the past few decades, the number of emerging infectious diseases that spread to people — especially coronaviruses and other respiratory illnesses believed to have come from bats and birds — has skyrocketed. A new emerging disease surfaces five times a year. One study estimates that more than 3,200 strains of coronaviruses already exist among bats, awaiting an opportunity to jump to people. The diseases may have always been there, buried deep in wild and remote places out of reach of people. But until now, the planet’s natural defense systems were better at fighting them off. Today, climate warming is demolishing those defense systems, driving a catastrophic loss in biodiversity that, when coupled with reckless deforestation and aggressive conversion of wildland for economic development, pushes farms and people closer to the wild and opens the gates for the spread of disease.

## 4

#### CP text: The US:

#### ---Loan an additional 4 billion dollars of additional funding to close the pre-purchase gap of 350 million vaccines to achieve world-wide immunity

#### ---Eliminate export restriction on critical medicines during pandemics.

#### The CP solves pandemics better – the aff misidentifies the problem.

Goldberg 20 [PINELOPI KOUJIANOU; Former World Bank Group chief economist and editor-in-chief of the American Economic Review, Professor of Economics at Yale University; “Forget the Vaccine Patent Waiver,” Project Syndicate; 5/13/21; <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/wto-vaccine-waiver-is-beside-the-point-by-pinelopi-koujianou-goldberg-2021-05>] Justin

What’s the issue, then? According to Agarwal and Reed, it is that companies are reluctant to activate their existing production capacity without pre-purchase commitments. There is currently a large gap between the number of doses that could be produced and the number that have been pre-ordered. And, as one would expect, this gap is unevenly distributed. High-income countries have ordered more doses than they need and thus will end up with a surplus, whereas lower-income countries are far behind in pre-purchasing vaccines.

Under these circumstances, efforts to increase capacity by relaxing patent protections would do nothing to accelerate vaccinations in lower-income countries. A far more promising strategy is to help lower-income countries purchase vaccines, while channeling surplus doses from richer countries to wherever they are needed most.

To a large extent, this strategy is already being implemented, thanks to the efforts of the COVAX Advanced Market Commitment facility, together with concessional loans by multilateral institutions such as the World Bank, and regional initiatives such as the one being led by the African Union. Remarkably, Agarwal and Reed show that the COVAX AMC facility and the AU initiative already have ensured that most African countries have ordered enough vaccines to cover at least 50% of their populations.

Still, three critical challenges remain. First, closing the pre-purchase gap of 350 million vaccines will requires an additional $4 billion – a trivial cost relative to the potential benefit of achieving worldwide immunity. Providing this support, either through additional funding for the COVAX AMC facility or by sending surplus vaccines to developing countries as soon as possible, should not be too difficult or costly for high-income countries to manage.

Second, the World Bank needs to relax its conditions for extending loans for vaccine pre-purchases. Currently, such loans can be used only for vaccines approved by three stringent regulatory authorities (SRAs) in three different regions. Among these are Japan and certain Western countries, which naturally prioritize approval of vaccines intended for their own populations. They have little incentive to grant emergency-use authorization to alternative vaccines that have shown high efficacy in Phase 3 clinical trials, such as Bharat Biotech’s Covaxin (India), and Gamaleya’s Sputnik V (Russia), and Sinovac Biotech’s CoronaVac (China). Extending the list of national regulators classified as SRAs would go a long way toward increasing lending for vaccine purchases.1

Finally, existing vaccine manufacturers will be unable to meet their production targets if vaccine nationalism gives rise to export restrictions on critical inputs and raw materials. We saw such behavior early in the pandemic with respect to personal protective equipment, but the resulting export restrictions proved short-lived. One hopes the same will be true for vaccines. International cooperation and coordination will be crucial in the coming months.

There are many ways for advanced economies to assist poorer countries in vaccinating their populations as soon as possible. But relaxing patent protections – however appealing the idea may be in other contexts – is not one of them. The focus should be on providing additional funding and less restrictive lending for pre-ordering vaccines, and on funneling surpluses from high-income countries to the rest of the world.

#### Solves vaccine diplomacy better.

Ezell 21 [Stephen; Vice president, global innovation policy, at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF). He focuses on science and technology policy, international competitiveness, trade, manufacturing, and services issues. He is the coauthor of Innovating in a Service-Driven Economy: Insights, Application, and Practice (Palgrave Macmillan, 2015) and Innovation Economics: The Race for Global Advantage (Yale, 2012). Ezell comes to ITIF from Peer Insight, an innovation research and consulting firm he cofounded in 2003 to study the practice of innovation in service industries. At Peer Insight, Ezell led the Global Service Innovation Consortium, published multiple research papers on service innovation, and researched national service innovation policies being implemented by governments worldwide. Prior to forming Peer Insight, Ezell worked in the New Service Development group at the NASDAQ Stock Market, where he spearheaded the creation of the NASDAQ Market Intelligence Desk and the NASDAQ Corporate Services Network, services for NASDAQ-listed corporations. Previously, Ezell cofounded two successful innovation ventures, the high-tech services firm Brivo Systems and Lynx Capital, a boutique investment bank. Ezell holds a B.S. from the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, with an honors certificate from Georgetown’s Landegger International Business Diplomacy program; “Ten Reasons Why a COVID-19 TRIPS IP Waiver Is Unwarranted,” ITIF; 4/9/21; <https://itif.org/publications/2021/04/09/ten-reasons-why-covid-19-trips-ip-waiver-unwarranted>] SJMS

9. Why Reward the Nation Responsible for the COVID-19 Pandemic? The Chinese government deserves blame for the staggering extent of the global COVID-19 pandemic. Whether it arose from natural origins or was incubated in a laboratory and accidently escaped, the fact is that China has worked from the very beginning to obfuscate the origins, transmissibility, and lethality of the virus from the global community. And with nearly 3 million global citizens dead from COVID-19, including 550,000 Americans, making this fact clear before the international community should be an essential and continuing priority for the Biden administration. Moreover, the United States has invested billions to become a global leader in life-sciences innovation, including with regard to the novel mRNA technologies underpinning many of the innovative vaccines and therapeutics now at the heart of responding to this crisis. Indeed, as Josh Rogin notes, “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.” Endorsing the TRIPS waiver may well result in the forced transfer of national security-sensitive technology to China or other adversarial nations, like Russia. As Mark Cohen, distinguished senior fellow at the University of California at Berkeley, explains, “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.” Throughout the pandemic, it’s been clear that state-sponsored hackers from a number of countries—including China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea—have been engaging in concerted attempts to steal coronavirus vaccine secrets. Why would the United States now embrace a petition that compels U.S. enterprises to freely and unconditionally divulge that IP, especially when they are already working to do so in a responsible, structured way through voluntary licensing which ensures that selected partners have the necessary capacity and expertise to manufacture the needed vaccines and therapeutics? 10. A TRIPS Waiver Is The Wrong Way To Pursue Vaccine Diplomacy The economic, trade, and foreign policymaking of the previous administration was, to put it kindly, chaotic. Assertions that Canadian steel or European cars constituted national security risks, alongside withdrawing the United States from the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which was poised to anchor U.S. trade relations with friendly nations throughout the Pacific region, to name just two instances, constituted grave and unforced geostrategic errors. It is perfectly appropriate that the Biden administration is seeking to restore America’s image as a reliable, dependable, supportive, and empowering partner in international affairs. And it is absolutely right to recognize the COVID-19 pandemic as an opportunity to restore America’s positive image on the global stage. (In fact, properly conceived, the situation provides a world-historical moment to shift the global narrative against a repressive regime whose behavior was complicit in making this a far worse global crisis than it ever should have been.) However, the way to seize the moment is by solving the problem, not by signing on to abrogating IP rights. The U.S. government should recognize its challenge not as producing enough COVID-19 vaccines and therapeutics to meet U.S. needs, but as supporting the manufacturing of enough to meet global demand. In February 2021, the Biden administration provided an initial $2 billion contribution to COVAX, with a commitment to release an additional $2 billion through 2021 and 2022, of which the first $500 million will be made available when existing donor pledges are fulfilled and initial doses are delivered to advanced-market commitment (AMC) countries. Thus far, COVAX has been able to secure at least 2 billion doses, The Economist notes, enough to protect health-care workers and the oldest and most vulnerable in all 192 of its members. To be sure, more will be needed. The United States should immediately double its already generous funding for COVAX, and it should invest billions more domestically to dramatically scale up U.S. biopharmaceutical manufacturing to produce these medicines (with a clear eye to leaving U.S. industry stronger after the encounter, as in WWII) and then export them to developing nations around the world. The United States undoubtedly has a moral obligation to lead the world in solving this challenge, but the way to do so is by helping developing nations cover the cost of procuring the needed vaccines and therapeutics—and/or by covering the cost of dramatically increasing American enterprises’ own capacity to manufacture those medicine. But absolutely none of that needs to entail a blanket sacrifice of IP rights.