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Debt Ceiling DA

#### Debt ceiling bill’s going to pass now, but business interests are key to force GOP to cave --- debt ceiling is key to prevent drastic economic collapse, aid to Americans, and further legislation

Barron-Lopez and Cadelago 9-9 [Lauara Barron-Lopez and Christopher Cadelago are White House Correspondents for Politico. “Biden wants to force Republicans to vote on the debt ceiling, sensing they’ll cave.” September 9, 2021. https://www.politico.com/news/2021/09/09/biden-mcconnell-debt-limit-threats-510922]

President Joe Biden is treating the latest Republican threats over the debt limit like a bluff. And the entire party, from congressional Democratic leadership to the top brass at the Treasury Department, is calling them on it. Multiple Democratic sources on the Hill and with knowledge of the White House’s thinking said the administration wants to include a suspension of the debt limit — a legal cap on how much the U.S. can borrow — in a continuing resolution to fund the government. Such a bill, which Congress is expected to consider as early as this month, would require 60 votes to pass in the Senate, meaning at least 10 Republicans would need to vote to advance the measure. To challenge those Republicans, Biden is also calling on Congress to include funding for hurricane relief in the bill, and Democratic leadership has continued to shoot down questions about possible alternative legislative vehicles in recent conversations with members and close allies. Including a debt limit increase in Democrats’ pending party-line reconciliation package, for example, is one option. But the White House and Democratic leaders are not entertaining it at present. “They're right at the moment to say, 'We're working on Plan A,'” said a lobbyist with knowledge of the party’s strategy. “The minute you start to signal that that doesn't work then you're signaling weakness.” The posture from the president on down is setting up a game of chicken with incredibly high stakes — if a vote to suspend or increase the debt limit fails, the U.S. economy will likely crater. Treasury officials have said lawmakers will have until an unspecified date next month before the department runs out of ways to prevent a default. The debt limit is the foundation of the “full faith and credit” of the country’s currency and bonds. If it isn’t raised or suspended, the U.S. defaults on its bond investors, its credit rating could tank and, in turn, the government could be forced to scale back on Medicare benefits, Social Security checks and other programs. The belief in the White House is that a mix of pressure — from business leaders expressing urgency to fears of a full blown financial crisis — will be most acute on Republicans as the deadline nears. After voting for years to suspend or increase the debt limit with Democrats — a routine step required by law — GOP lawmakers in recent history have used the threat of default to score political points when a Democratic president is in charge. Learning from his former boss, President Barack Obama — who vowed not to negotiate over the debt ceiling after doing it once — Biden is essentially daring Republicans to vote down a debt limit suspension or increase. Since Republicans led by Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell announced publicly that his party members wouldn’t support an increase in the debt limit, the Biden administration has not had any additional talks with him on the issue. McConnell’s office pointed to the senator’s past comments on the debt ceiling but did not address whether the two sides had talked. A White House official said the administration is largely deferring to congressional leaders on the procedural aspects of how to pursue a debt limit increase or suspension. Whether Democrats are pursuing a long- or short-term increase remains unclear. In public and private conversations and briefings with Hill aides, the White House has two main positions: Don’t negotiate with Republicans over what should be a routine vote and clearly message that the debt limit addresses past, not future, spending, seeking to avoid confusion and rebuff GOP attacks over a complex topic. “The debt limit is a function of bills that Congress has already passed, already wrapped up,” said Brian Deese, director of the White House National Economic Council. “Even if Congress took no future action ever, did nothing else in the future, Congress would have to raise or suspend the debt limit because it’s a reflection of actions already taken.” The showdown comes as Biden faces a grueling month that will determine the fate of his signature economic items: the bipartisan infrastructure bill and social spending package. On top of that, government funding runs out Sept. 30, the coronavirus pandemic continues to rage and parts of the country are struggling to rebuild after devastating hurricanes and wildfires. “With everything from Covid to Afghanistan to the weather incidents, the idea that we would self inflict another blow to our country right now and even putting in potential jeopardy the full faith and credit of the United States would be crazy,” said Sen. Mark Warner (D-Va.). Warner said it’s imperative that Democrats clearly articulate why a default is so cataclysmic and that Republicans are also responsible for the debt limit. “Do you really want to vote for shutting down the government, not giving aid to people who are the third of Americans who've had weather affect [them] and mess with the full faith and credit of the United States all in one vote?” Warner said of Republicans. “I hope not.” Warner added that a decade ago, there was near unanimity about the dangerous consequences of not raising the debt limit. “But that was before there was an age of the level of misinformation and disinformation,” he said. “This was not a tool that was used against President Trump so on a fairness argument, we’re making the case. Whether that wins the day at a time when things are so unusual, time will tell.” To stave off a crisis, the administration is also having conversations with business leaders and community bankers and expects them to apply pressure to Republicans with warnings that a default would be catastrophic for the economy, the White House official said. Others who have spent years working on the issue said the fiscal cliff standoff between Obama and Republicans in 2011 — and the resulting lessons both parties have taken since — is informing Biden’s strategy as president. Seth Hanlon, a former special assistant to Obama at the National Economic Council, said the lesson from that episode is that the debt limit is plainly non-negotiable. Republicans took away a different lesson altogether. At the time, they refused to vote to raise the debt limit unless they got corresponding budget cuts. Obama negotiated with congressional GOP leaders on a deal and, after talks scuttled, Biden himself picked up the baton and hammered out an agreement with McConnell. McConnell later said he came away believing that the debt limit, which underlies the financial well-being of the country, was “a hostage that's worth ransoming." That standoff between Democrats and Republicans resulted in the nation’s credit rating being downgraded for the first time in history, something Treasury officials have pointed to in recent days as evidence that even negotiations over the debt limit have damaging consequences. “There were a number of times after 2011 where there was a lot of Republican hue and cry over the debt limit when Obama was president, but ultimately, Mitch McConnell found the cover for himself and his members and joined in raising it,” said Hanlon, now a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress. So far, McConnell has put the onus squarely on Biden and Democrats to raise the debt limit, saying last month that “they have the House, the Senate and the presidency. It’s their obligation to govern … and the essence of governing is to raise the debt ceiling to cover the debt.” In recent remarks on the subject, McConnell stressed that “the debt ceiling needs to be raised,” but said the emphasis is “who should do it. And under these uniquely unprecedented circumstances,” he added, “it’s their obligation to do it.” But Hanlon said he’s confident that pressure from Republican allies in the conservative ranks of big business will ultimately force them to capitulate. “They’re attuned to financial markets and they know the disastrous consequences that will result,” he said of the GOP brinkmanship on Capitol Hill. “As extreme as the Republican Party has become, I don't think McConnell is ultimately willing to push the U.S. over the cliff.”

#### Big Pharma backlashes --- deep money ties to GOP in Congress means they pull the strings

Hutteman 20 [Emmarie Huetteman, Correspondent, came to KHN from The New York Times, where she covered Congress with a focus on the House of Representatives and, most recently, the investigations into Russian meddling in the 2016 election. “Senators who led pharma-friendly patent reform also prime targets for pharma friendly cash.” Mar. 24, 2020. https://khn.org/news/senators-who-led-pharma-friendly-patent-reform-also-prime-targets-for-pharma-cash/]

As the new gatekeeper for laws and oversight of the nation’s patent system, the North Carolina Republican signaled he was determined to make it easier for American businesses to benefit from it — a welcome message to the drugmakers who already leverage patents to block competitors and keep prices high. Less than three weeks after introducing a bill that would make it harder for generic drugmakers to compete with patent-holding drugmakers, Tillis opened the subcommittee’s first meeting on Feb. 26, 2019, with his own vow. “From the United States Patent and Trademark Office to the State Department’s Office of Intellectual Property Enforcement, no department or bureau is too big or too small for this subcommittee to take interest,” he said. “And we will.” In the months that followed, tens of thousands of dollars flowed from pharmaceutical companies toward his campaign, as well as to the campaigns of other subcommittee members — including some who promised to stop drugmakers from playing money-making games with the patent system, like Sen. John Cornyn (R-Texas). Tillis received more than $156,000 from political action committees tied to drug manufacturers in 2019, more than any other member of Congress, a new analysis of KHN’s Pharma Cash to Congress database shows. Sen. Chris Coons (D-Del.), the top Democrat on the subcommittee who worked side by side with Tillis, received more than $124,000 in drugmaker contributions last year, making him the No. 3 recipient in Congress. No. 2 was Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.), who took in about $139,000. As the Senate majority leader, he controls what legislation gets voted on by the Senate. Neither Tillis nor Coons sits on the Senate committees that introduced legislation last year to lower drug prices through methods like capping price increases to the rate of inflation. Of the four senators who drafted those bills, none received more than $76,000 from drug manufacturers in 2019. Tillis and Coons spent much of last year working on significant legislation that would expand the range of items eligible to be patented — a change that some experts say would make it easier for companies developing medical tests and treatments to own things that aren’t traditionally inventions, like genetic code. They have not yet officially introduced a bill. As obscure as patents might seem in an era of public outrage over drug prices, the fact that drugmakers gave most to the lawmakers working to change the patent system belies how important securing the exclusive right to market a drug, and keep competitors at bay, is to their bottom line. “Pharma will fight to the death to preserve patent rights,” said Robin Feldman, a professor at the UC Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco who is an expert in intellectual property rights and drug pricing. “Strong patent rights are central to the games drug companies play to extend their monopolies and keep prices high.” Campaign contributions, closely tracked by the Federal Election Commission, are among the few windows into how much money flows from the political groups of drugmakers and other companies to the lawmakers and their campaigns. Private companies generally give money to members of Congress to encourage them to listen to the companies, typically through lobbyists, whose activities are difficult to track. They may also communicate through so-called dark money groups, which are not required to report who gives them money. Over the past 10 years, the pharmaceutical industry has spent about $233 million per year on lobbying, according to a new study published in JAMA Internal Medicine. That is more than any other industry, including the oil and gas industry. Why Patents Matter Developing and testing a new drug, and gaining approval from the Food and Drug Administration, can take years and cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Drugmakers are generally granted a six- or seven-year exclusivity period to recoup their investments. But drugmakers have found ways to extend that period of exclusivity, sometimes accumulating hundreds of patents on the same drug and blocking competition for decades. One method is to patent many inventions beyond a drug’s active ingredient, such as patenting the injection device that administers the drug. Keeping that arrangement intact, or expanding what can be patented, is where lawmakers come in. Lawmakers Dig In Tillis’ home state of North Carolina is also home to three major research universities and, not coincidentally, multiple drugmakers’ headquarters, factories and other facilities. From his swearing-in in 2015 to the end of 2018, Tillis received about $160,000 from drugmakers based there or beyond. He almost matched that four-year total in 2019 alone, in the midst of a difficult reelection campaign to be decided this fall. He has raised nearly $10 million for his campaign, with lobbyists among his biggest contributors, according to OpenSecrets. Daniel Keylin, a spokesperson for Tillis, said Tillis and Coons, the subcommittee’s top Democrat, are working to overhaul the country’s “antiquated intellectual property laws.” Keylin said the bipartisan effort protects the development and access to affordable, lifesaving medication for patients,” adding: “No contribution has any impact on how [Tillis] votes or legislates.” Tillis signaled his openness to the drug industry early on. The day before being named chairman, he reintroduced a bill that would limit the options generic drugmakers have to challenge allegedly invalid patents, effectively helping brand-name drugmakers protect their monopolies. Former Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), whose warm relationship with the drug industry was well-known, had introduced the legislation, the Hatch-Waxman Integrity Act, just days before his retirement in 2018. At his subcommittee’s first hearing, Tillis said the members would rely on testimony from private businesses to guide them. He promised to hold hearings on patent eligibility standards and “reforms to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.” In practice, the Hatch-Waxman Integrity Act would require generics makers challenging another drugmaker’s patent to either take their claim to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, which acts as a sort of cheaper, faster quality check to catch bad patents, or file a lawsuit. A study released last year found that, since Congress created the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in 2011, it has narrowed or overturned about 51% of the drugmaker patents that generics makers have challenged. Feldman said the drug industry “went berserk” over the number of patents the board changed and has been eager to limit use of the board as much as possible. Patent reviewers are often stretched thin and sometimes make mistakes, said Aaron Kesselheim, a Harvard Medical School professor who is an expert in intellectual property rights and drug development. Limiting the ways to challenge patents, as Tillis’ bill would, does not strengthen the patent system, he said. “You want overlapping oversight for a system that is as important and fundamental as this system is,” he said. As promised, Tillis and Coons also spent much of the year working on so-called Section 101 reform regarding what is eligible to be patented — “a very major change” that “would overturn more than a century of Supreme Court law,” Feldman said. Sean Coit, Coons’ spokesperson, said lowering drug prices is one of the senator’s top priorities and pointed to Coon’s support for legislation the pharmaceutical industry opposes. “One of the reasons Senator Coons is leading efforts in Congress to fix our broken patent system is so that life-saving medicines can actually be developed and produced at affordable prices for every American,” Coit wrote in an email, adding that “his work on Section 101 reform has brought together advocates from across the spectrum, including academics and health experts.” In August, when much of Capitol Hill had emptied for summer recess, Tillis and Coons held closed-door meetings to preview their legislation to stakeholders, including the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, or PhRMA, the brand-name drug industry’s lobbying group. “We regularly engage with members of Congress in both parties to advance practical policy solutions that will lower medicine costs for patients,” said Holly Campbell, a PhRMA spokesperson. Neither proposal has received a public hearing. In the 30 days before Tillis and Coons were named leaders of the revived subcommittee, drug manufacturers gave them $21,000 from their political action committees. In the 30 days following that first hearing, Tillis and Coons received $60,000. Among their donors were PhRMA; the Biotechnology Innovation Organization, the biotech lobbying group; and five of the seven drugmakers whose executives — as Tillis laid out a pharma-friendly agenda for his new subcommittee — were getting chewed out by senators in a different hearing room over patent abuse. Cornyn Goes After Patent Abuse Richard Gonzalez, chief executive of AbbVie Inc., the company known for its top-selling drug, Humira, had spent the morning sitting stone-faced before the Senate Finance Committee as, one after another, senators excoriated him and six other executives of brand-name drug manufacturers over how they price their products. Cornyn brought up AbbVie’s more than 130 patents on Humira. Hadn’t the company blocked its competition? Cornyn asked Gonzalez, who carefully explained how AbbVie’s lawsuit against a generics competitor and subsequent licensing deal was not what he would describe as anti-competitive behavior. “I realize it may not be popular,” Gonzalez said. “But I think it is a reasonable balance.” A minute later, Cornyn turned to Sen. Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa), who, like Cornyn, was also a member of the revived intellectual property subcommittee. This is worth looking into with “our Judiciary Committee authorities as well,” Cornyn said, effectively threatening legislation on patent abuse. The next day, Mylan, one of the largest producers of generic drugs, gave Cornyn $5,000, FEC records show. The company had not donated to Cornyn in years. By midsummer, every drug company that sent an executive to that hearing had given money to Cornyn, including AbbVie. Cornyn, who faces perhaps the most difficult reelection fight of his career this fall, ranks No. 6 among members of Congress in drugmaker PAC contributions last year, KHN’s analysis shows. He received about $104,000. Cornyn has received about $708,500 from drugmakers since 2007, KHN’s database shows. According to OpenSecrets, he has raised more than $17 million for this year’s reelection campaign. Cornyn’s office declined to comment. On May 9, Cornyn and Sen. Richard Blumenthal (D-Conn.) introduced the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act, which proposed to define two tactics used by drug companies to make it easier for the Federal Trade Commission to prosecute them: “product-hopping,” when drugmakers withdraw older versions of their drugs from the market to push patients toward newer, more expensive ones, and “patent-thicketing,” when drugmakers amass a series of patents to drag out their exclusivity and slow rival generics makers, who must challenge those patents to enter the market once the initial exclusivity ends. PhRMA opposed the bill. The next day, it gave Cornyn $1,000. Cornyn and Blumenthal’s bill would have been “very tough on the techniques that pharmaceutical companies use to extend patent protections and to keep prices high,” Feldman said. “The pharmaceutical industry lobbied tooth and nail against it,” she said. “And when the bill finally came out of committee, the strongest provisions — the patent-thicketing provisions — had been stripped.” In the months after the bill cleared committee and waited to be taken up by the Senate, Cornyn blamed Senate Democrats for blocking the bill while trying to secure votes on legislation with more direct controls on drug prices. The Senate has not voted on the bill.

**Economic crisis escalates to nuke war**

Dr. Qian **Liu 18**, PhD in Economics from Uppsala University, Former Visiting Researcher at the University of California, Berkeley, Managing Director for Greater China at The Economist Group, Guest Lecturer at New York University, Tsinghua University, the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and Fudan University, “The Next Economic Crisis Could Cause A Global Conflict. Here's Why”, World Economic Forum, 11-13, https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the **current social, political, and technological landscape**, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well **escalate** into a **major global military conflict**. The 20**08**-09 global financial crisis **almost** bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates. But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies. Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment. The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929. As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy. If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend **far beyond** the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel **unrest**, **terrorism**, or even **war**. For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 **Smoot-Hawley** Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, **World War II** had begun. To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict. According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels. This is **all the more worrying** in view of the **numerous other factors** stoking social unrest and diplomatic tension, including **technological disruption**, a **record-breaking migration crisis**, **anxiety over globalization**, **political polarization**, and **rising nationalism**. All are symptoms of failed policies that could turn out to be **trigger points** for a future crisis. Voters have good reason to be frustrated, but the emotionally appealing populists to whom they are increasingly giving their support are offering ill-advised solutions that will only make matters worse. For example, despite the world’s unprecedented interconnectedness, **multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed**, as countries – most notably, Donald Trump’s US – pursue unilateral, isolationist policies. Meanwhile, **proxy wars** are **raging** in Syria and Yemen. Against this background, we must take seriously the possibility that the next economic crisis could lead to a **large-scale military confrontation**. By the logic of the political scientist Samuel Huntington , considering such a scenario could help us avoid it, because it would force us to take action. In this case, the key will be for policymakers to pursue the structural reforms that they have long promised, while replacing finger-pointing and antagonism with a sensible and respectful global dialogue. The alternative may well be **global conflagration**.
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Fishing DA

#### WTO consensus on fishing subsidies likely now but requires negotiations- consensus is key to solving overfishing- the brink is now.

Koop 7-30 [Fermin; Argentine journalist specializing in the environment with experience across diverse publications; “WTO Inches Towards a Deal to End Harmful Fishing Subsidies,” Maritime-Executive; 7/30/21; https://www.maritime-executive.com/editorials/wto-inches-towards-a-deal-to-end-harmful-fishing-subsidies]

After more than 20 years of negotiations, the World Trade Organization (WTO) has moved a step closer to an agreement on ending harmful fishing subsidies. The deal would set new rules for the global fishing industry and limit government funding that contributes to unsustainable fishing and the depletion of global fish stocks. In a meeting with government ministers and heads of national delegations, WTO members vowed to finish the negotiations before the WTO’s Twelfth Ministerial Conference (MC12) in late November, and to empower their delegations in Geneva to do so. Members also said the negotiating text currently on the table can be used as the basis to strike a final agreement. “It’s been a successful day,” WTO chief Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala told reporters at the close of the meeting. “In 20 years of negotiations, this is the closest we have ever come towards reaching an outcome – a high-quality outcome that would contribute to building a sustainable blue economy. I feel new hope.” The talks’ chair, Santiago Wills, was also upbeat: “I believe that the answers today have given us the ingredients to reach a successful conclusion. Members now want to move to text-based negotiations. Twenty years has been long enough. If we continue [negotiating] for another 20 years, there won’t be any fish left.” Negotiators at the WTO had been tasked with eliminating subsidies for illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and prohibiting certain subsidies that contribute to overcapacity and overfishing. Talks have been going on since 2001 but differences between governments have hindered progress. 2020 had been set as a deadline to strike an agreement, but talks were delayed due to Covid-19 restrictions and the US presidential elections. A deadline was then set for this July, which was again missed. Now, Okonjo-Iweala, appointed as head of the WTO in March, aims to reach an agreement by year-end in what will be a key test for the organization’s credibility, with members deadlocked on other fronts. “In international negotiations of this type only two things are relevant. The nitty-gritty to make sure everybody is on the same page, and the spirit that prevails. If Ngozi and Wills reflected correctly what happened in the meeting, we can say there’s cautious optimism over an agreement,” Remi Parmentier, director of environmental consultancy The Varda Group, told China Dialogue Ocean. A potential agreement At the meeting, ministers discussed an eight-page draft agreement, which lists a range of subsidy bans and some conditions for exemptions for poorer countries, all of which are yet to be finalised. While some delegations like the EU were positive, several ministers expressed reservations over the content of the text. “Clearly, it will lead to capacity constraints for developing countries, while advanced nations will continue to grant subsidies,” Indian trade minister Piyush Goyal said at the meeting, regarding one part of the text. Pakistan described the draft as “regressive and unbalanced,” while the African coalition said “significant gaps” remain. Countries’ differences were acknowledged by Ngozi and Wills at the meeting. Nevertheless, they remain optimistic and said the issues would be resolved once countries move into text-based negotiations. The agreement on fishing subsidies will require a consensus among all member states, according to WTO rules. The draft deal essentially proposes three categories of prohibited subsidies; those that support IUU fishing, affect overfished stocks, or lead to overcapacity and overfishing. While this may sound simple, the political, economic and cultural complexities represent real challenges. One of the main issues has been the demand for developing countries and the poorest nations to receive so-called special and differential treatment. While this is widely accepted for the poorest countries, demands from self-identified developing countries to be exempt from subsidy constraints has proven to be difficult to accept. Many of the major fishing nations are considered developing countries by the WTO, including China, which has one of the world’s biggest fishing fleets. China’s minister of commerce, Wang Wentao, expressed China’s “support for the conclusion of [fishing subsidies] negotiations before the end of MC12.” Speaking at the meeting on 15 July, Wang stressed that concluding the negotiations would represent a major contribution from the WTO to the United Nations’ 2030 Sustainable Development Goals. “As a developing country and a major fishing power, China will take on obligations commensurate with our level of development," he said. At the meeting, Wang also introduced China’s emphasis on green development in future policies on fishing subsidies and its “zero-tolerance” policy towards IUU. Isabel Jarrett, manager of The Pew Charitable Trusts’ project to end harmful fisheries subsidies, told China Dialogue Ocean that an agreement “with too many loopholes” would undermine the WTO’s sustainability goals. The final text has to ensure that governments aren’t allowed to subsidize “irresponsible practices that can hurt fish populations,” she added. The scale of the problem Subsidies paid to the global fishing industry amount to around $35 billion per year (228 billion yuan). Of this, $20 billion is given in forms that enhance the capacity of large fishing fleets, such as fuel subsidies and tax exemption programmes, according to the European Parliament’s Committee on Fisheries. In 2018, the world’s top 10 providers of harmful fisheries subsidies gave out $15.4 billion in total, according to a report by Oceana. The EU, as a bloc, provided $2 billion, ranking third behind China and Japan. Research by Pew has found that eliminating all harmful subsidies could help fish populations recover. Specifically, it would result in an increase of 12.5 percent in global fish biomass by 2050, which translates into nearly 35 million metric tonnes of fish – almost three times Africa’s entire fish consumption in a single year. The need for progress on an agreement has gained new urgency during the last few years, as the world’s fish populations have continued to fall below sustainable levels. Around 60 percent of assessed stocks are fully exploited and 30 percent are overexploited, according to the latest figures from the UN Food and Agriculture Organization. The termination of harmful subsidies, which is embedded in the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), would be seen as key progress on ocean sustainability ahead of this year’s UN biodiversity conference in Kunming, scheduled for October, and the COP26 climate summit in Glasgow in November. “This is the year that the agreement has to be delivered. The WTO chief has made positive pronouncements of an agreement this year. There’s light at the end of this 20-year tunnel. The alternative of being in the tunnel shadows is a depressing prospect at the time ocean life is declining,” Peter Thomson,?UN special envoy for the ocean, said in a recent webinar.

#### Negotiations on IPR require tradeoffs- empirics prove.

DC = DEVELOPING COUNTRY

NET = NET EXPORTER OF TECH (advanced countries)

TNC = Trade Negotiations Committee

Anell = Lars Anell the Chair of the TRIPS negotiations

Marcellin 16 Marcellin, Sherry (Professor, London School of Economics). The political economy of pharmaceutical patents: US sectional interests and the African Group at the WTO. Routledge, 2016. SJMS

Regarding the provisions in the section on patents, including that on exclusions from patentability, another DC negotiator maintained that the stipulations should reflect ‘a well-balanced system’ (ibid: 3). Ironically however, he proceeded to categorise the texts as ‘reasonably satisfactory’, contending that a positive attitude of his delegation towards them would depend to a large extent on progress in other areas of the negotiation (ibid). This was the second time in the negotiations that a DC delegate made such an obvious attempt to concede in TRIPS while seeking bargains in other negotiating areas, suggesting that the real access-to-medicines implications of patents were not fully appreciated by all such participants (Abbott 2002: 43–4); and that such participants may have understood that the negotiations would not have culminated in their favour. Immediately after the April TNC of 1989 a similarly affiliated participant had also affirmed that if some participants were to be required to make sacrifices in the area of IPRs, there should be a readiness to make such sacrifices for their benefit in agriculture, natural resources or other negotiating groups (MTN.GNG/NG11/13: 5).10 This first declaration could be construed as a signal of a prejudged outcome that disfavoured DCs. Towards the end of this session another DC participant, supported by several others, pointed out that some other delegations had very high ambitions in the area of TRIPS and that the time had come to review the subject matter in the context of the Uruguay Round negotiations as a whole, particularly in relation to what was being offered in the more traditional areas of the GATT (ibid: 12). At these final stages in the negotiations, DCs were actively seeking trade-offs in other areas in return for agreeing to IPRs in the manner in which the NETs had anticipated (Adede 2003: 30 and Matthews 2002: 109). Anell’s informal consultations and his proposed bilateral bargaining strategies worked in tandem to consolidate the weakening position of DCs propagated during the April TNC meeting in 1989. Anell ended this final session by sharing concerns expressed about the need for results in all areas of the UR, explicitly urging delegations to manufacture consensus through concessionary bargaining. The effects would later be seen in Dunkel’s ‘Draft Final Acts Embodying the Results of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations’.11

#### That collapses biodiversity.

Osmanski 20 [Stephanie; Freelance Journaler, Writer at GreenMatters; “How Does Overfishing Affect Biodiversity? Let's Do a Deep Dive,” GreenMatters; 12/29/20; https://www.greenmatters.com/p/how-overfishing-affects-biodiversity] Justin

Three out of seven people — about 260 million worldwide — rely on seafood as their primary source of protein, which means the environmental and health impacts of fishing are more relevant than ever. In fact, overfishing is becoming a huge problem; Conservation.org reports that one-third of the world’s wild-caught fisheries are depleted as a direct result of overfishing, pollution, and climate change. As fish populations decline, farmed fisheries have started supplying most of our seafood, which is often plagued with additives, growth hormones, genetically modified organisms, and even food dye. However, overfishing results in other issues, too — mainly, environmental issues. Overfishing significantly affects biodiversity, which in turn, changes the ecosystem. Keep reading to find out more on how overfishing contributes to biodiversity. What is overfishing? Overfishing refers to non-sustainable practices of fishing that result in the depletion of fish species. In layman’s terms, overfishing happens when fishermen catch fish faster than the fish can reproduce. Long ago, when fishing relied on more natural methods (instinct, word-of-mouth, and guesswork), fishing practices were more natural and therefore, sustainable. But due to modern technology, fishermen now get significant help from high-tech machinery that can detect and track schools of fish, enable fishermen to explore new areas of water they had not been able to access before, and also embark in deeper waters. According to the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), over 70 percent of the world’s fisheries are “fully exploited,” “over exploited,” or “significantly depleted” as a direct result of overfishing. What is biodiversity? Biodiversity refers to the variety of life on Earth, referring to our planet’s vast number of biological species and organisms. It's heavily impacted when certain species cease to exist, or become threatened at a rate that is faster than that species can reproduce. Ultimately, the number of plants, animals, and microorganism species on Earth determines biodiversity. According to Global Issues, varying genes in each of these species also contributes to more biodiversity. If ecosystems or species become threatened or cease to exist, biodiversity decreases — and ultimately, all walks of life are impacted — because of the degrading food chain and other necessary biological processes. How does overfishing affect biodiversity? Overfishing impacts biodiversity in more ways than one — per Marine Science Today, overfishing alters the food chain. If a certain species is wiped out due to overfishing, the animals that rely on that species as a food source could starve, or might resort to eating other species of fish, thus altering the ecosystem and food chain as a whole. On the other end of the spectrum, the population generally consumed by the extinct species would grow disproportionately, often making way for an influx of pests. Overfishing creates a domino effect that impacts all living organisms, therefore significantly affecting biodiversity. Why is biodiversity important? Biodiversity is necessary, because every organism plays a role in the eco-system. If one species is compromised, biodiversity becomes compromised as a whole: the food chain, ecosystems, and more. The more biodiversity there is on this planet, the more productive ecosystems are, contributing to a greater availability of biological resources. Apart from food, biodiversity impacts medicinal resources, wood products, and ornamental plants. Biodiversity also helps ecosystems recover in cases of disaster. If a weather event threatens natural disasters, healthy, biodiverse ecosystems have a better chance of bouncing back. It also ensures protection of water resources, soil formation, nutrient storage and recycling, and the necessary breakdown of pollution. Why is marine biodiversity is important to humans? Aside from assuring food security, marine biodiversity also provides social and socioeconomic benefits. Socioeconomically, many areas of the world rely on fisheries to survive. If fishermen cannot sell seafood, fisheries cannot purchase fish, and these ways of life are forced out of business. A side effect of that would be that so many populations that rely on fisheries would be out of their main source of protein. Biodiversity also brings many social benefits to human populations: the opportunities to research and educate about fisheries, natural habitats, ecosystems, and various species. It also increases tourism and recreational activities, while having a lasting cultural impact, too — if specific populations rely on a species for food, loss of that population would affect that population’s culture and food supply. Marine biodiversity is incredibly important — let's take a stand against overfishing to ensure it doesn't plague eco-systems and human populations alike. TBH, might be best to go fish-free. instead.

#### Biodiversity loss causes extinction.

Torres 19[Phil; Affiliate Scholar at the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, Founder of the X-Risks Institute, Writer Appearing in Skeptic, Free Inquiry, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Salon, Truthout, Erkenntnis, Metaphilosophy; “Biodiversity Loss: An Existential Risk Comparable To Climate Change,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists; 4/11/16; https://thebulletin.org/2016/04/biodiversity-loss-an-existential-risk-comparable-to-climate-change/] Justin

Catastrophic consequences for civilization. The consequences of this rapid pruning of the evolutionary tree of life extend beyond the obvious. There could be surprising effects of biodiversity loss that scientists are unable to fully anticipate in advance. For example, prior research has shown that localized ecosystems can undergo abrupt and irreversible shifts when they reach a tipping point. According to a 2012 paper published in Nature, there are reasons for thinking that we may be approaching a tipping point of this sort in the global ecosystem, beyond which the consequences could be catastrophic for civilization.

As the authors write, a planetary-scale transition could precipitate “substantial losses of ecosystem services required to sustain the human population.” An ecosystem service is any ecological process that benefits humanity, such as food production and crop pollination. If the global ecosystem were to cross a tipping point and substantial ecosystem services were lost, the results could be “widespread social unrest, economic instability, and loss of human life.” According to Missouri Botanical Garden ecologist Adam Smith, one of the paper’s co-authors, this could occur in a matter of decades—far more quickly than most of the expected consequences of climate change, yet equally destructive.

Biodiversity loss is a “threat multiplier” that, by pushing societies to the brink of collapse, will exacerbate existing conflicts and introduce entirely new struggles between state and non-state actors. Indeed, it could even fuel the rise of terrorism. (After all, climate change has been linked to the emergence of ISIS in Syria, and multiple high-ranking US officials, such as former US Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel and CIA director John Brennan, have affirmed that climate change and terrorism are connected.)

The reality is that we are entering the sixth mass extinction in the 3.8-billion-year history of life on Earth, and the impact of this event could be felt by civilization “in as little as three human lifetimes,” as the aforementioned 2012 Nature paper notes. Furthermore, the widespread decline of biological populations could plausibly initiate a dramatic transformation of the global ecosystem on an even faster timescale: perhaps a single human lifetime.

The unavoidable conclusion is that biodiversity loss constitutes an existential threat in its own right. As such, it ought to be considered alongside climate change and nuclear weapons as one of the most significant contemporary risks to human prosperity and survival.

#### The impact is two pronged- subsidies drive climate change at an unprecedented rate, undermine food security and livelihoods- killing and displacing millions.

Bladon 20 Annabelle Bladon (researcher in IIED’s Shaping Sustainable Markets research group), 1/15/2020, Scrap devastating fishing subsidies to help save the ocean and climate, The International Institute for Environment and Development. https://www.iied.org/scrap-devastating-fishing-subsidies-help-save-ocean-climate SJKS

Marine fisheries – particularly industrial operations – rely heavily on fossil fuels. In 2016, global marine fishing fleets emitted more than 200 million tonnes of CO2 from onboard fuel combustion alone. That is almost as much as Belgium and Nigeria’s combined annual carbon emissions. Add the emissions generated from such indirect sources as vessel construction, ice production, refrigeration, processing, packaging and transportation, and its total carbon emissions are even higher. Despite a dramatic decline in global marine fish catches since the mid-1990s, global fuel emissions from fishing fleets have been steadily rising. Although small-scale fisheries have rapidly become more fuel intensive, the overall rise in emissions is primarily due to industrial fishing’s growth in capacity stimulated by subsidies. Twenty-two per cent of global fisheries subsidies are spent on fuel. Because they reduce the substantial cost of fuel, industrial fishers can travel greater distances and fish for longer using such fuel-intensive methods as bottom trawling and dredging. By scrapping these subsidies, the cost of travel alone would make most high seas fishing unprofitable. Low-income communities hardest hit Not only are subsidies devastating fish stocks and causing emissions to rise, they are also contributing to poverty and malnutrition. In 1974, 10% of fish stocks were overfished, by 2015 this figure rose to 33%. This has had a profound impact on people in low-income coastal and small island nations who depend heavily on marine resources for protein and income. In 2000, an estimated 20 million people worldwide could have avoided malnutrition if the trend in overfishing was reversed. What’s more, the most fuel-intensive fishing methods tend to be the most environmentally destructive. The more fish stocks decline, the more fuel-intensive fishing operations become, and the more emissions are released. These emissions are driving changes in the climate that are impacting marine and coastal ecosystems at an unprecedented rate and scale, as the latest IPCC report on the ocean shows. It threatens the livelihoods and food security of vulnerable coastal communities around the world, while hundreds of millions of women, children and men are being displaced by sea level rise and increasingly extreme storm surges. The WTO needs to agree a set of rules that ends harmful subsidies, meaning fishers will need to adopt more fuel-efficient and environmentally sustainable practices. Subsidy reform would also free up money that governments could invest in rebuilding fish stocks and supporting vulnerable groups and small-to-medium sized enterprises in their transition to sustainable practices. This year is a watershed for tackling the climate emergency and the biodiversity crisis. Reforming fisheries subsidies would be a significant step forward in both areas. This first in a series of meetings over the next six months gives the new WTO chair, Colombia’s ambassador Santiago Wills, the opportunity to reinvigorate negotiations. It is critical that he does not delay further – the ocean cannot wait.

### 1NC – OFF

Carbon Tax CP

#### The member nations of the World Trade Organization should apply an extraction fee on private sector greenhouse gas emissions starting at $43/ton CO2e.

#### The CP solves climate change --- the electricity sector is key.

Kaufman, Obeiter, & Krause 16 (Noah Kaufman, economist for the US Climate Initiative in the Global Climate Program, Michael Obeiter, Senior Associate in World Research Institute’s Global Climate Initiative, and Eleanor Krause, Researcher and Analyst for World Research Institute’s Carbon Pricing program, “Putting a Price on Carbon: Reducing Emissions,” January 2016, https://www.wri.org/sites/default/files/Putting\_a\_Price\_on\_Carbon\_Emissions.pdf)

Electricity Sector The electricity sector produces more greenhouse gas emissions than any other sector in the United States. Over four billion megawatt hours of electricity are produced each year, approximately two thirds of which are produced using fossil fuels (U.S. EIA 2015a). The result is over 2 billion metric tons of annual CO2 -equivalent emissions, which comprise roughly one third of total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions (U.S. EPA 2013a). For the United States to meet its emissions reduction targets, fossil fuel usage in the electricity sector must be significantly curtailed. Fortunately, there are viable alternatives. Nuclear energy provides nearly 20 percent of total electricity generation, and renewables provide another 13 percent (U.S. EIA 2015b). The amount of electricity produced by solar and wind energy in particular has increased dramatically in the past decade as the costs of these technologies have plummeted (Feldman et al. 2012), making them a more viable alternative to fossil-fuel generation each year. Still, absent strong climate change policies, the transition away from fossil fuels is unlikely to occur quickly enough to enable the United States to achieve its emissions targets. Accounting for the effects of the Clean Power Plan (the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions from existing power plants), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) forecasts that fossil fuels will still comprise about 60 percent of U.S. electricity generation in 2030. As explained below, carbon pricing can have dramatic effects on emissions in the electricity sector. As soon as the policy is implemented, high carbon generating units will operate less often because of higher operating costs. The carbon price will also change decisions about how much electricity to consume, which plants to build, and what efficiency measures to implement. Simultaneously, pricing carbon will induce investments in low-carbon technologies, the development of which will be crucial if the United States is to meet its long-term emissions targets. Very Short-run Response to a Carbon Price in the Electricity Sector A carbon price translates societal costs of climate change into explicit costs to electricity producers, and the price of electricity will incorporate these additional costs. In response, some producers and consumers will adjust their behavior to save money, as they would in response to any other increase in costs. Unlike in other sectors, where change takes place gradually, the electricity sector has systems in place to adjust to the carbon price virtually immediately. In any power system, due to the difficulties of storing electricity, producers build sufficient generating capacity to exceed customers’ maximum demand levels. As a result, significantly more resources are usually available to serve customers than are needed on a daily basis. The resources operating at any given time depend on a multitude of factors—including geographic location, the costs of starting and stopping power plants, and whether plants are engaged in a bilateral contract—but no factor is as important as operating costs (U.S. EIA 2012). In simplified terms, power plants with the lowest costs of operation are “dispatched” first, and those with higher costs are brought on line sequentially as demand increases (U.S. EIA 2012.) Because demand for electricity is constantly fluctuating, the dispatch of power plants changes frequently as well. Electricity grids are therefore designed to respond almost immediately to changes in the cost of fuel (due to a carbon price or any other (and greatly oversimplified) electricity grid “dispatch curve,” with and without a carbon price. Because a carbon price increases the costs of operating fossil-fuel units in proportion to the carbon content of the fuel, the primary consequence (in the very short run) is a reduction in generation from coal units, which have the highest emissions rate of any electricity source. The biggest beneficiaries of this immediate adjustment are natural gas units, whose operating costs (with no carbon price) are higher than coal plants on average (U.S. EIA 2015c) but, because of the lower carbon content of natural gas, pay a carbon price that is only 50 to 60 percent of the price paid by coal plants for the same generation (U.S. EIA 2015d). Once built, the costs of operating nuclear and renewable energy units are typically much lower than those of coal or natural gas plants, so a carbon price will not significantly affect the usage of these units in the very short run (but a carbon price does incentivize the construction of more renewable plants, as explained below). Indeed, changes in operating costs have caused large fluctuations in coal and natural gas usage in recent years (see Box 2 below), confirming the intuition of Figure 2. Short-run Effects of Carbon Pricing in the Electricity Sector In the short run, responses to a carbon price in the electricity sector are somewhat constrained by existing commitments and the lags associated with construction and large purchases. Nevertheless, both producers and consumers will begin to change their behavior in the short run when the costs of carbon-intensive goods and services increase. Owners of electricity generation facilities can retrofit or refurbish fossil-fuel power plants so that they produce the same amount of electricity while burning less carbon. A coal plant operator will find that efficiency alternatives that were too costly without a carbon price are cost-effective with one. A study by Resources for the Future concluded that a carbon price of $10 per metric ton would lead to reductions in emissions rates at coal plants of 1 to 2 percent, with higher prices leading to greater efficiencies (Linn et al. 2014). Because the carbon price also encourages reduced usage of coal fired power plants, the efficiency gains will lead to emissions reductions (in contrast, policies that mandate efficiency improvements can encourage coal units to operate more often, because more efficient plants are less costly to operate) (Linn et al. 2014). A carbon price also affects electricity consumption decisions. When the price of electricity increases, consumers tend to use less of it (EPRI 2008). Lower demand for electricity will typically lead to a fall in usage of fossil-fuel power plants because they have the highest operating costs. Reduced electricity usage also implies lower electricity bills, and the net effect of a carbon price on electricity bills depends on the extent to which consumers respond to the price change.3 Economists have exhaustively studied the extent to which electricity demand decreases when prices increase (referred to as the “price elasticity of demand”). Table 1 displays the results of recent studies of the short-run (i.e. usually within the first few years, although definitions vary) and longrun responsiveness of U.S. electricity consumers to electricity price changes. In the short run, consumers respond to changes in electricity prices by reducing their demand for electricity, but they do not respond as much as they do over longer periods, when consumers have had the opportunity to invest in more efficient machinery and appliances. Short-run elasticities between −0.1 and −0.4 imply that a 10 percent price increase would only lead to a 1−4 percent reduction in electricity use. Some consumers may at first perceive the price change to be temporary (if they notice it at all), and others may not adjust their behavior until they purchase new equipment or appliances. Long-run Effects of Carbon Pricing in the Electricity Sector In the long run, consumers are more responsive to a carbon price, in large part because they are less constrained by currently installed technologies. The long-run price elasticities in Table 1 imply that a 10 percent electricity price increase will lead to an average of 3 to 12 percent reductions in electricity use. Such a wide range should not be surprising, considering the diversity of consumers and electricity uses across the economy. Consumer responses to a carbon price may be larger than are suggested by these empirical estimates based on general electricity price changes, for several reasons. First, a carbon price may be perceived as more permanent, which could cause consumers to change their behavior rather than wait for temporary price increases to subside. In addition, the salience of the tax may coax consumers into fundamentally reducing electricity consumption, either to save money or for altruistic reasons (Chetty et al. 2007). The UK introduced a “Climate Change Levy” in 2001 that taxed electricity use at roughly 10 percent. A study of manufacturing plants and other commercial users found that electricity use declined by over 22 percent at plants subject to the tax compared to plants that were eligible to opt out (Martin et al. 2011), which implies a much larger response than the elasticities presented above. (The authors of the study caution that some of this shift away from electricity in the UK may have been toward gas and coal, which were taxed at lower rates, thus offsetting the emissions reductions from the policy.) Finally, progress with “smart grids” and home energy management products could enable individuals and businesses to respond more efficiently to price signals than they have in the past. A carbon price will also have long run effects on electricity production. Hundreds of new electricity generating units are brought online each year in the United States, either to meet additional demand for electricity or to replace older generating units (U.S. EIA 2015e). A carbon price would have a substantial impact on decisions regarding which plants are most cost-effective to build and operate over their lifetimes. A useful (though imperfect) metric to compare the costs of different types of new power plants is the levelized cost of electricity (LCOE), which depicts the lifetime costs of producing a given amount of electricity, including the costs of building and operating the plant. Figure 4 displays LCOE estimates from the company Lazard, with and without illustrative carbon prices of $25 and $50 per metric ton. Coal plants are omitted because few are likely to be built in the United States going forward.4 Figure 4 shows that with a carbon price, wind and solar become more competitive with natural gas, which has been the dominant source of fossil-fuel electricity being added to the grid for more than a decade (Shellenberger et al. 2014). While (unsubsidized) solar would remain more expensive than natural gas in some regions of the country at today’s prices, this will change if the cost of solar energy continues to fall (Feldman et al. 2012). Building wind and solar units in lieu of natural gas plants avoids decades of emissions that would come from those plants (although it also introduces challenges associated with more unpredictable generation sources). Forecasts of Emissions Reductions in the Electricity Sector A carbon price will cause grid operators to dispatch lower-carbon generation alternatives, producers to retrofit existing power plants and build new lower-carbon plants, and consumers to use less electricity. Taken together, these actions will lead to substantial emissions reductions in the electricity sector. U.S. EIA estimated the effects of a national carbon price in its 2014 Annual Energy Outlook Report (U.S. EIA 2014a).5 EIA’s modeling is widely cited and highly influential, and its results are broadly similar to other prominent energy/economic models (Fawcett et al. 2015) (many of which rely in part on information from EIA). We display results for EIA’s carbon price scenarios that start at a price of $25 per metric ton (in 2012 dollars) in 2015, growing at 5 percent per year. This carbon price trajectory is comparable to certain projections of carbon prices from the cap-and-trade program that passed the U.S. House of Representatives in 2009 (as part of the American Clean Energy and Security Act, commonly known as “Waxman-Markey”) (U.S. EIA 2009). However, the price trajectory is low compared to economists’ and scientists’ best estimates of the carbon prices needed to achieve long-term emissions targets.6 While implementation of a national economy-wide carbon price in the next few years is unlikely, EIA’s results should be viewed as illustrative of how a model of the U.S. economy and energy system forecasts the impacts of a carbon price over the first 10 to 15 years of implementation. Table 2 displays the results of EIA’s analysis for the electricity sector. Retail electricity prices increase by 14 percent in 2030 compared to the Reference Case (which differs only in its lack of a carbon price), leading to a reduction in electricity usage of 6 percent. Recall that the best estimates of long-run price elasticities from Table 1 range from -0.3 to -1.2, implying that a 14 percent price increase would lead to a decrease in demand between 4 and 17 percent. EIA’s forecast of 6 percent is near the bottom of that range. On the supply side, the carbon price causes coal use to decline by 85 percent below the Reference Case level in 2030. (For comparison, EPA projects the Clean Power Plan to cause a reduction in coal usage of 22 to 23 percent by 2030 (U.S. EPA 2015).) Natural gas usage increases rapidly in the initial years to replace this coal generation. By 2030, with higher carbon prices and more time to build new infrastructure, renewable energy increasingly replaces coal (and to some extent natural gas) generation. EIA’s forecasts of changes in electricity supply are pessimistic in that the model does not consider the possibility of transformative changes or disruptive technological progress. It assumes that no new technologies provide meaningful competition to fossil fuels, even though a carbon price will increase the incentive for technological progress (discussed in the next section). In fact, the recent trends of rapidly decreasing costs of solar and wind technologies are assumed not to continue—for example, the projected costs of building utility-scale solar photovoltaic generating plants are assumed to remain higher through 2025 than typical cost estimates from 2014.7 Consequently, the extent to which wind and solar generation is available to replace coal and natural gas generation is constrained in EIA’s analysis, and consumers are not increasingly responsive to price changes due to innovative “smart grid” technologies. Still, EIA projects that the carbon price reduces electricity sector emissions in 2030 by over 60 percent below Reference Case emissions levels. Actual emissions reductions in the sector could be larger or smaller. But if clean energy technologies continue to improve, it is far more likely that a carbon price will cause larger emissions reductions than are predicted in these conservative forecasts.Very Long-run Effects of Carbon Pricing in the Electricity Sector For the United States to meet its goal of over 80 percent emissions reductions by 2050, a transformation of the electricity sector is essential. This will occur only through the development and scaling of new technologies. Most studies of carbon pricing focus on the effects described above because they are relatively predictable. We can measure how consumer demand changes with electricity prices and how low-carbon supply options become more competitive when a carbon price is implemented. But CO2 stays in the atmosphere for hundreds of years and, while the climate is changing today, the worst damages from climate change are decades or centuries away. For that reason, the most important effects of carbon pricing occur over a long-term time scale. A major benefit of carbon pricing policies is that they encourage technological change, so the menu of cost-effective low-carbon alternatives available to producers and consumers will expand over time. The process that drives technological change is complex and not entirely understood. It includes the invention of new technologies, improvements to existing technologies, and the adoption and diffusion of technologies throughout the economy (Jaffe et al. 2003). We refer to inducing technological change as a “very long-run” effect because it can take decades for new technologies to mature, but the advancements can occur quickly as well (particularly improvements and cost reductions for existing technologies). Private businesses fund over 60 percent and perform over 70 percent of total R&D in the United States, with industry responsible for even larger portions of applied research and product development (Newell 2015). A carbon price increases incentives for private businesses to invest in low-carbon technologies because it affects the expected return on investments.

#### CX proves it solves

#### Conditionality is good –

#### 1. Logic – draw a line – disproving the CP doesn’t prove the plan is good – their irrational interp kills education and predictability.

#### 2. Critical thinking – multiple worlds force us to make our best args.

#### 3. Real world education – policymakers must defend their args from the left and right.

#### 4. Neg flex – they speak first and last, get more prep, and write vague plans – outweighs 1ar skew.

#### Not a voter – they must win what we did made it impossible – anything else trades off with substance.
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Universities CP

#### Text: Universities should make no cost, transparent licensing agreements to make genome editing technology available for further research by universities and non-profit organizations.

Nature 21 (No Author, 9-7-2021, "License CRISPR patents for free to share gene editing globally," Nature, https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-02420-x )

This week, Wageningen University and Research in the Netherlands announced that it will allow non-profit organizations to use its CRISPR–Cas9 gene-editing technology for free, for non-commercial applications in food and agriculture. It’s an important development, and another step towards making a technology with untapped potential more accessible — especially for researchers in low- and middle-income countries. Wageningen is one of a clutch of research institutions globally that hold patents on CRISPR, a technique that enables precise changes to be made to genomes, at specific locations. Other institutions — including the Broad Institute in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and the University of California, Berkeley, which have some of the largest portfolios of patents on the subject — also provide CRISPR tools and some intellectual property (IP) for free for non-profit use. But universities could do better to facilitate access to CRISPR technologies for research. The field is snowballing. The US Patent and Trademark Office alone has around 6,000 CRISPR patents or patent applications, with 200 being added every month, mostly from China and the United States. Worldwide CRISPR patent landscape shows strong geographical biases But unusually, universities and publicly funded research organizations dominate the CRISPR patenting landscape. As of 2017, only one-third of CRISPR patents came from the private sector, according to an analysis by Agnès Ricroch, a plant geneticist at the institute AgroParisTech, and her colleagues (J. Martin-Laffon et al. Nature Biotechnol. 37, 613–620; 2019). That means universities are in a strong position to influence change. And change begins with the licensing agreement — which is needed even when an organization is using IP for research. Licensing agreements should be transparent, so that institutions offering access can be held accountable for the promises they make. But few publish these agreements, out of concern that it would give their competitors an advantage. However, if universities all agreed not to charge for IP used in research, they would no longer be in competition, and could collaborate to create model agreements. Licensing agreements should also limit ‘reach-through clauses’. These allow patent holders to claim rights on commercialization of discoveries and inventions based on their IP, many years into the future. It’s a method of prolonging income, but has been likened to authors paying royalties to Google or Microsoft if they write a book on the companies’ word-processing software. For centuries, patents have helped to protect inventors’ IP from competitors who would otherwise be able to copy and profit from someone else’s idea. Patents also incentivize the investment needed to develop or commercialize an idea, because they reassure investors that a technology cannot easily be copied.

#### CX proves