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#### **Discourse of coronavirus as an existential risk is weaponized to endorse the West’s economic and political interest while weakening the “other”, this feeds into the ideology of securitization which only reinforces the Western colonial and racialized view of China as the “sick man of Asia”**
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At the end of the 19th century, the imperialist western powers, during their “civilizing” mission of plundering in the Middle East, Africa and Asia, depicted China as the “sick man of Asia”. This derogatory term to define China can be related to wider processes of racialisation which were deemed as instrumental by the imperialist powers to legitimize their colonial adventures overseas. In an article published in 1897 titled “On the future strength of China”, the Confucian reformist Liang Qichao (梁啓超) wrote on how Western imperialism was scourging a decadent Qing empire in its final stages. Liang analysed how the Western press at the end of the 19th century had become a propaganda machine of the imperialist interests in China. In regard to this problem, Liang (in Karl, 2020) asserted “I read Western newspapers and they report on… the disorder in the Chinese polity… This has been going on for the past few decades. Since September or October of last year [1896], they have been more openly and brazenly publicized how wild and uncivilized the Chinese are, how ignorant and dishonest, how empty Chinese Confucianism is. The meaning is clear: they will move to eliminate China at once.” After examining how Western media, and specifically the US and the British news outlets, is reporting the global effects of the coronavirus, one might argue that the legacies of colonial domination remain imprinted in the ways in which coronavirus is represented in popular discourses. Following Liang’s analysis, I suggest that Western media has securitized and weaponised the social effects and perceptions generated by the global crisis of the coronavirus. In other words, the coronavirus has been constructed in the public debate as a security threat. This in turn has shaped the way it has been perceived by the public. In practise, this means that such social effects and perceptions, after being securitized, have become a weapon that can be utilized against political or economic opponents, in this case, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). In this sense, coronavirus, by being treated as an existential threat, has moved beyond being a global health problem, but a global security matter that needs intervention – at times through the use of extraordinary measures, which can be used as a political and economic weapon-. According to Thierry Braspenning-Balzacq (2005, p.179), “securitization is a rule-governed practice, the success of which does not necessarily depend on the existence of a real threat, but on the discursive ability to effectively endow a development with such a specific complexion”. Fred Vultee (2007, p.2-3) argued about the importance of new media in the process of securitization. “Media frames are the lens through which the public sees an issue like terrorism or immigration either as a routine matter best dealt with through the normal 3 workings of law enforcement and politics or as a crisis that requires extreme measures for indefinite periods”. With this in mind, the securitization and weaponization of the coronavirus is therefore not accidental, given the intertwined relation between western media and economic and political interests. Whilst this piece does not seek to undermine the serious health effects of the coronavirus nor to excuse the Chinese government for its terrible adventures in its periphery such as in Xinjiang or romanticize the anti-imperialist legacy of CCP, it does maintain that it is essential to critically analyse such phenomena. Why has a virus with a mortality rate of 2.2% – according to data published by the UN and WHO on the 31st of January – caused such a stir in the international press? The answer is to be found in the contemporary geopolitics of capitalist competition, which is shaping the social, political and economics processes caused by the coronavirus. On the one hand, the weaponization of the coronavirus that has been fostered by the Western media has enabled a subtle media attack on China. The aim of this manoeuvre is to produce an image of disorder that casts doubt on the management of the crisis by the CCP. In addition to this, it seeks to question the global campaign of soft power that China has been promoting for the last decade. The deterioration of the Chinese regime that the Hong Kong protests sought to achieve, could be gained instead through a media campaign of misinformation on the coronavirus. In this vein, the German media Deutsche Welle [published an article](https://www.dw.com/en/did-chinas-authoritarianism-actually-help-the-coronavirus-spread/a-52268341) considering the relation between the authoritarian nature of the Chinese government and the expansion of the coronavirus. Nevertheless, the Western media forgot to mention on its front pages the 10,000 deaths caused by influenza in the US – the great bulwark of liberal democracy – between 2019 and 2020. Could anyone imagine the European governments sending planes to rescue European citizens in the US from the crisis caused by the Influenza? On the other hand, the securitization of the coronavirus has allowed the implementation of emergency measures such as the rescue of Western citizens in China, cancellation of university classes, exams, flights, important business decisions, etc. Even though these activities have been framed under the necessity of protecting citizens from the coronavirus, I contend that in practice all these measures have been covert or collateral activities that have deeply affected the Chinese economy. In other words, against some of the views that argue that this virus is the chief reason of the current destabilization of the Chinese and global economy, I contend that the securitization of its social effects and perceptions have been the main cause of the deacceleration of China and global economy. Regarding the economic effects of the coronavirus, on the 3rd of February of 2020, the BBC [published an article](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-51352535) that discussed how the Shanghai Composite Index, the stock market index of all stocks that are traded at the Shanghai Stock Exchange, had “closed nearly 8% lower, its biggest daily drop for more than four years”. “Manufacturing, materials goods companies were among the hardest hit, while healthcare shares soared”. In an [infamous article](https://www.wsj.com/articles/china-is-the-real-sick-man-of-asia-11580773677) published on the WSJ titled “China is the real sick man of Asia”, the professor of International Relations Walter Russel Mead declared that “the likeliest economic consequence of the coronavirus epidemic, forecaster expect, will be a short and sharp fall in China’s economic growth in the first quarter of 2020, and recovering as the disease fades”. In addition to this, Mead argued that the “most important long-term outcome would appear to be a strengthening of a trend for global companies to “de-sinize” their supply chains. Add the continuing public health worries to the threat of new trade wars, and supply chain diversification looks prudent”. In essence, what Trump government hasn’t achieved during the last impasse of the trade war with China, might be gained through the weaponization of the social effects and perceptions spawned by a media campaign of misinformation about the coronavirus. Against this backdrop, the rampant racism that the Chinese community has experienced in the West is not accidental. It is thus a result of an irresponsible media campaign triggered by the Western media that once again is endorsing political and economic interests that not differ much from those that Liang Qichao was criticizing at the end of the 19th century. In this light, we shouldn’t be afraid of the coronavirus but of the aggressive geopolitical situation that is weaponizing health issues and is leading humanity to a collective disaster.

#### Drop the debater – judges have an ethical obligation to foster an atmosphere to education, hold debaters accountable for what they endorse
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Charles Mills argues that “the moral concerns of African Americans have centered on the assertion of their personhood, a personhood that could generally be taken for granted by whites, so that blacks have had to see these theories from a location outside their purview.” For example, I witnessed a round at a tournament this season where a debater ran a utilitarianism disadvantage. His opponent argued that this discourse was racist because it ignores the way in which a utilitarian calculus has distorted communities of color by ignoring the wars and violence already occurring in those communities. In the next speech, the debater stood up, conceded it was racist, and argued that it was the reason he was not going for it and moved on, and still won the debate. This is problematic because it demonstrates exactly what Mill’s argument is. For the black debater this argument is a question of his or her personhood within the debate space and the white debater was not held accountable for the words that are said. Again for debaters of color, their performance is always attached to their body which is why it is important that the performance be viewed in relation to the speech act. Whites are allowed to take for granted the impact their words have on the bodies in the space. They take for granted this notion of personhood and ignore the concerns of those who do not matter divorced from the flow. It is never a question of “should we make arguments divorced from our ideologies,” it is a question of is it even possible. It is my argument that our performances, regardless of what justification we provide, are always a reflection of the ideologies we hold. Why should a black debater have to use a utilitarian calculus just to win a round, when that same discourse justifies violence in the community they go back home to? Our performances and our decisions in the round, reflect the beliefs that we hold when we go back to our communities. As a community we must re-conceptualize this distinction the performance by the body and of the body by re-evaluating the role of the speech and the speech act. It is no longer enough for judges to vote off of the flow anymore. Students of color are being held to a higher threshold to better articulate why racism is bad, which is the problem in a space that we deem to be educational. It is here where I shift my focus to a solution. Debaters must be held accountable for the words they say in the round. We should no longer evaluate the speech. Instead we must begin to evaluate the speech act itself. Debaters must be held accountable for more than winning the debate. They must be held accountable for the implications of that speech. As educators and adjudicators in the debate space we also have an ethical obligation to foster an atmosphere of education. It is not enough for judges to offer predispositions suggesting that they do not endorse racist, sexist, homophobic discourse, or justify why they do not hold that belief, and still offer a rational reason why they voted for it. Judges have become complacent in voting on the discourse, if the other debater does not provide a clear enough role of the ballot framing, or does not articulate well enough why the racist discourse should be rejected. Judges must be willing to foster a learning atmosphere by holding debaters accountable for what they say in the round. They must be willing to vote against a debater if they endorse racist discourse. They must be willing to disrupt the process of the flow for the purpose of embracing that teachable moment. The speech must be connected to the speech act. We must view the entire debate as a performance of the body, instead of the argument solely on the flow. Likewise, judges must be held accountable for what they vote for in the debate space. If a judge is comfortable enough to vote for discourse that is racist, sexist, or homophobic, they must also be prepared to defend their actions. We as a community do not live in a vacuum and do not live isolated from the larger society. That means that judges must defend their actions to the debaters, their coaches, and to the other judges in the room if it is a panel. Students of color should not have the burden of articulating why racist discourse must be rejected, but should have the assurance that the educator with the ballot will protect them in those moments. Until we re-conceptualize the speech and the speech act, and until judges are comfortable enough to vote down debaters for a performance that perpetuates violence in the debate space, debaters and coaches alike will remain complacent in their privilege. As educators we must begin to shift the paradigm and be comfortable doing this. As a community we should stop looking at ourselves as isolated in a vacuum and recognize that the discourse and knowledge we produce in debate has real implications for how we think when we leave this space. Our performances must be viewed as of the body instead of just by it. As long as we continue to operate in a world where our performances are merely by bodies, we will continue to foster a climate of hostility and violence towards students of color, and in turn destroy the transformative potential this community could have.

#### K outweighs everything, Reps K critique in round actions, can’t weigh case against this K because its implications are in round.

### DA:

#### 1] Long discussion times and inability to produce COVID vax at a mass scale ends aff solvency. Secondly, the aff harms future investment into vax needed for new strains
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While the proposed request for the WTO waiver stirs up political theater, it is unlikely to lead to meaningful improvements in developing country access to vaccines in the near-term. Months of difficult negotiation regarding the scope and the duration of the waiver are likely before a WTO consensus can be achieved.

More important, patents and other forms of intellectual property are not the main (or even a significant) barrier to improved developing country access at this time. Leading U.S. and EU vaccine developers have already licensed their technologies to Indian, Chinese, Russian, and South African vaccine manufacturers. Instead, the problem has been that the unprecedented global demand for COVID-19 vaccines has far outrun limited global production capacity. Even with access to IP, ramping up new vaccine production would require construction and qualification of new facilities to manufacture vaccines, a difficult, specialized, and exacting process, given the high stakes and the potentially life-threatening costs of failures. It also requires access to critical inputs, many of which are in short supply because of the unprecedented demand. Making advanced mRNA vaccines requires mastering new forms of vaccine production, given that it represents a new technology. And vaccine production requires critical know-how, raising questions about whether a WTO waiver will involve forced technology transfers. Finally, to date, one of the biggest challenge to developing country access has been that much of the worldwide supply of COVID-19 vaccines was bought up by the U.S., EU, and other wealthy economies, who have limited exports until their own populations are fully vaccinated.

Despite its political appeal, a waiver involves risks of inadvertent consequences, since it would discourage future investments in new vaccine technologies and treatments at a time when they may be urgently needed to deal with new variations of the virus. It appears at odds with the Biden Administration’s “Build Back Better” initiatives to move production of key medical technologies back onshore, build more resilient U.S. supply chains, and support U.S. global leadership in biomedical innovation, since it would transfer leading U.S. technologies abroad to China, India, Russia, and South Africa, among others.

Conclusion

While the U.S. has bought into the idea of a waiver, a difficult and protracted WTO negotiation lies ahead over the waiver’s scope, product coverage, and duration. India, China, and South Africa have very capable trade negotiators and will be riding high after the U.S. reversal. While COVID-19 puts unprecedented pressures on the WTO to reach an agreement, achieving a consensus of the WTO’s 164 Members – which is necessary to effect the waiver – is likely to be a complicated and time-consuming effort.

#### 2] Waiving patents for COVID vaccines doesn’t increase production AND it makes the extended response to current & future pandemics worse

Kappos, David J, and Paul R Michel. “Waiving Covid-19 Vaccine Patents Won’t Get Shots in Arms Faster. It Slows down New Vaccines.” NBC News, NBC News, 25 May 2021, [www.nbcnews.com/think/opinion/waiving-covid-19-vaccine-patents-won-t-get-shots-arms-ncna1268099. Accessed 16 Sept. 2021](http://www.nbcnews.com/think/opinion/waiving-covid-19-vaccine-patents-won-t-get-shots-arms-ncna1268099.%20Accessed%2016%20Sept.%202021).

WTO director-general Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala [said on Friday](https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/vaccine-patent-waiver-will-not-be-enough-wto-chief-2021-05-20/) that a full waiver of companies' Covid-19 vaccine patents under the World Trade Organization's auspices — sought by many developing countries and supported by President Joe Biden to combat disproportionate access to the therapies — will not be enough to speed up the provision of vaccines to countries where it is lagging.

On that small point, at least, we agree: The nations that spearheaded the petition to waive the patent rights at the WTO, India and South Africa, have been unable to provide any evidence that the international system of respecting intellectual property rights under the law have impeded the development, production or distribution of Covid-19 vaccines and treatments.

And it is hard to imagine that any such evidence will be forthcoming, as intellectual property is facilitating — not inhibiting — the pharmaceutical industry's pandemic response.

Normally fierce rival companies have been able to cooperate on vaccine production precisely because inventors know their property rights are — and will remain — secure. For instance, Johnson & Johnson invited Merck to help manufacture its viral-vector vaccine, while Pfizer and BioNTech, which jointly developed their revolutionary mRNA vaccine, are similarly working with French drug giant Sanofi to boost its production.

And generics manufacturers are already working around the clock on a contract basis with innovator firms to produce vaccines. For instance, India's largest generics manufacturer, the Serum Institute, is producing billions of doses of the AstraZeneca vaccine for low-income countries, while South Africa's largest generics firm, Aspen Pharmacare, is producing hundreds of millions of doses of Johnson & Johnson's vaccine.

India and South Africa's petition to nullify intellectual property protections, were it to have been in effect, would have made those collaborations impossible.

Suspending intellectual property rights will not get shots in arms any faster at this point and would, in fact, undermine efforts to scale up vaccine production. As Okonjo-Iweala herself pointed out last week, though it will take time to negotiate a wholesale change to WTO treaties, the capacity to manufacture Covid-19 vaccines already exists in Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Thailand, Senegal and South Africa but is currently sitting idle despite existing frameworks giving manufacturers in those places the right to start.

The EU, in the meantime, has [offered a counterproposal](https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/eu-present-wto-plan-boost-vaccine-production-2021-05-19/) to waive or minimize export restrictions on vaccines and vaccine components, to pledge to supply vaccines to countries with shortages at cost and to allow more countries to take advantage of existing WTO rules that allow countries to license intellectual property without the consent of the patent holders, essentially allowing for an increasing production capacity without waiving the patent rights altogether. So while the appeal of an intellectual property waiver is tempting in the short-run, doing so imperils our ability to develop new medicines and combat future pandemics. The Biden administration, however, announced its support for such a petition earlier in May and progressive groups cheered, contending that the intellectual property suspension would hasten and make more equitable the global vaccine rollout by enabling more manufacturers to produce the vaccines developed by Western firms.

And, certainly, the rapid and equitable distribution of Covid-19 vaccines is absolutely critical to ending this pandemic. But sacrificing the innovation ecosystem in order to achieve this end would be myopic policy.

There are already very real challenges to inoculating the world, including a widespread lack of proper refrigeration (let alone the ultracold storage required for some vaccines), a shortage of trained professionals to administer them and conduct follow-up evaluations, and a lack of patient compliance with the two-dose regimen for the Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna jabs.

Plus, there have already been issues with fakes and a lack of trust in the government that have come into play. In Mexico and Poland, [authorities have identified](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.wsj.com/articles/pfizer-identifies-fake-covid-19-shots-abroad-as-criminals-exploit-vaccine-demand-11619006403__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!5im4XdWEGVpKy_ctvTTJNvidGqa0qNpMLCmOYVDuZgi0OzUdPpczT-h4tNU-_CdcL6-x$) counterfeit versions of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine. In Malawi, [the New York Times reported](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.nytimes.com/2021/04/14/world/europe/western-vaccines-africa-hesitancy.html__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!5im4XdWEGVpKy_ctvTTJNvidGqa0qNpMLCmOYVDuZgi0OzUdPpczT-h4tNU-_JTNQHUw$) that "people are asking doctors how to flush the AstraZeneca vaccine from their bodies." Suspending intellectual property rights will not remove any of these roadblocks and would likely exacerbate them. Without certain quality controls implemented by original patent holders, especially in places with existing levels of government or industrial corruption, we could see ineffective vaccines manufactured using substandard processes, and then administered without adequate refrigeration, professional handling or required counseling and follow up.

In this moment, leaders and policymakers in the developed world should focus their efforts on helping other nations overcome these challenges, rather than debating the finer points of intellectual property law at the WTO. The latter is a waste of precious time, especially since without intellectual property protections, there might never have been vaccines to debate — at least not yet.

Take Moderna's vaccine: A mere two days after Chinese authorities publicly disclosed Covid-19's genetic sequence in January 2020, Moderna had already [sequenced](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.modernatx.com/modernas-work-potential-vaccine-against-covid-19__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!5im4XdWEGVpKy_ctvTTJNvidGqa0qNpMLCmOYVDuZgi0OzUdPpczT-h4tNU-_JLzWrLk$) its vaccine candidate, mRNA-1273 — which ultimately proved 94.5 percent effective and became one of the first vaccines approved for emergency use in the United States and the European Union. (By way of comparison, the creation of viable vaccines for smallpox, chickenpox, typhoid fever and polio took decades.) Moderna's Covid-19 vaccine was the result of 10 years of work, which took [at least $2 billion](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.statnews.com/2020/11/10/the-story-of-mrna-how-a-once-dismissed-idea-became-a-leading-technology-in-the-covid-vaccine-race/__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!5im4XdWEGVpKy_ctvTTJNvidGqa0qNpMLCmOYVDuZgi0OzUdPpczT-h4tNU-_CQ_aUV5$) from investors. Investors were willing to support Moderna for so many years — and potentially lose billions in the process — because they knew both that its technology could revolutionize medicine and that the technology would be protected by intellectual property rules.

Investments in Moderna paid off — but [only 12 percent](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.phrma.org/-/media/Project/PhRMA/PhRMA-Org/PhRMA-Org/PDF/0-9/6--67416-Intellectual.pdf__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!5im4XdWEGVpKy_ctvTTJNvidGqa0qNpMLCmOYVDuZgi0OzUdPpczT-h4tNU-_N2nrSD8$) of investigational medicines entering clinical trials are ultimately approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Association. As the average cost of developing a new drug approaches [$3 billion](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.phrma.org/-/media/Project/PhRMA/PhRMA-Org/PhRMA-Org/PDF/0-9/6--67416-Intellectual.pdf__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!5im4XdWEGVpKy_ctvTTJNvidGqa0qNpMLCmOYVDuZgi0OzUdPpczT-h4tNU-_N2nrSD8$), it's clear that no firm would conduct research and development without the promise of intellectual property rights, which give companies exclusive ownership of their inventions and a chance to recoup the investments that made the drug possible.

Moderna's success should be a clear lesson for every policymaker: Swift global public health responses to the pandemics of tomorrow are predicated on incentivizing research and clinical development of new drug candidates and clinical pathways today. The explosion of biopharma research — and the number of novel drugs brought to market to combat Covid-19 — are directly linked to a strong system of intellectual property rights.

The WTO waiver on patent rights for Covid-19 vaccines — let alone requirements for broader technology transfers, which Okonjo-Iweala appeared to call for on Friday — could shatter this system. It is unrealistic to assume groundbreaking innovations will simply appear without solid and reliable protections for those who risk the time and money to develop them.

### DA:

#### The 1AC reduction in IP rights around medicine spills over to biotech, killing investment
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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), 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 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 [data] 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. 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 [biden] 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] 6-4-2019, "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, <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."

## Case:

#### Xap covid DA to the advantage, its resources not IP, also rich countries will still buy out even if price goes down. Companies in India will make more money selling to richer countries that can afford it rather than poorer ones that won’t give as much profit, no aff solvency

#### AT Kumar 1 – Aff doesn’t solve for this, viruses evolve that bio, not a matter of patent rights, also rich nations will keep buying even without IP, companies want profit

#### AT Kumar 2 – Read their own card, “Export blockages on raw materials, equipment and finished products harm the overall output of the vaccine supply chain”, aff doesn’t solve, they only reduce IPPs for COVID medicines not exports

#### AT Jecker – We can’t predict or control future pandemics, making prices cheaper means rich countries will just buy more, no aff solvency

#### AT RECNA – 1] Reps K, 2] Patently false, the impact portion says “some states may prolif”, doesn’t mean they will, also impact should have already happened, COVID been here for a while, literally no reason it happens 9/18/21 instead of last year

#### AT Adv 1 & Solvency - [Tabarrok 21] Waivers don’t solve – the issue is in lack of materials. Moderna literally tried the aff

Tabarrok 21

Alex Tabarrok (Bartley J. Madden Chair in Economics at the Mercatus Center and am a professor of economics at George Mason University). “Patents are Not the Problem!” Marginal Revolution. 6 May 2021. JDN. https://marginalrevolution.com/marginal revolution/2021/05/ip‐is‐not‐the‐constraint.html [Brackets in original] || cut SM

Patents are not the problem. All of the vaccine manufacturers are trying to increase supply as quickly as possible. Billions of doses are being produced–more than ever before in the history of the world. Licenses are widely available. AstraZeneca have licensed their vaccine for production with manufactures around the world, including in India, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, China and South Africa. J&J’s vaccine has been licensed for production by multiple firms in the United States as well as with firms in Spain, South Africa and France. Sputnik has been licensed for production by firms in India, China, South Korea, Brazil and pending EMA approval with firms in Germany and France. Sinopharm has been licensed in the UAE, Egypt and Bangladesh. Novavax has licensed its vaccine for production in South Korea, India, and Japan and it is desperate to find other licensees but technology transfer isn’t easy and there are limited supplies of raw materials:

Virtually overnight, [Novavax] set up a network of outside manufacturers more ambitious than one outside executive said he’s ever seen, but they struggled at times to transfer their technology there amid pandemic travel restrictions. They were kicked out of one factory by the same government that’s bankrolled their effort. Competing with larger competitors, they’ve found themselves short on raw materials as diverse as Chilean tree bark and bioreactor bags. They signed a deal with India’s Serum Institute to produce many of their COVAX doses but now face the realistic chance that even when Serum gets to full capacity — and they are behind — India’s government, dealing with the world’s worst active outbreak, won’t let the shots leave the country.

Plastic bags are a bigger bottleneck than patents. The US embargo on vaccine supplies to India was precisely that the Biden administration used the DPA to prioritize things like bioreactor bags and filters to US suppliers and that meant that India’s Serum Institute was having trouble getting its production lines ready for Novavax. CureVac, another potential mRNA vaccine, is also finding it difficult to find supplies due to US restrictions (which means supplies are short everywhere). As Derek Lowe said:

Abolishing patents will not provide more shaker bags or more Chilean tree bark, nor provide more of the key filtration materials needed for production. These processes have a lot of potential choke points and rate‐limiting steps in them, and there is no wand that will wave that complexity away.

Technology transfer has been difficult for AstraZeneca–which is one reason they have had production difficulties–and their vaccine uses relatively well understood technology. The mRNA technology is new and has never before been used to produce at scale. Pfizer and Moderna had to build factories and distribution systems from scratch. There are no mRNA factories idling on the sidelines. If there were, Moderna or Pfizer would be happy to license since they are producing in their own factories 24 hours a day, seven days a week (monopolies restrict supply, remember?). Why do you think China hasn’t yet produced an mRNA vaccine? Hint: it isn’t fear about violating IP. Moreover, even Moderna and Pfizer don’t yet fully understand their production technology, they are learning by doing every single day. Moderna has said that they won’t enforce their patents during the pandemic but no one has stepped up to produce because no one else can.

#### Adv 2:

#### AT meyer – no explanation for how it creates momentum for structural reform, nobody paid attention to WTO before this, why now will it create reform?

#### Xap Mauryama, long waiting times

#### AT Bacchus – HIV hard to solve cuz it mutates rapidly, evolution faster than innovation, also no way to get them vaccine, even if produced U.S./EU will buy out

#### AT Hamann – literally 9 years old, world has changed, no cards given about instability, just that WTO makes more stable so no reason to think nuke war insta happens, also WTO from 1994, we didn’t all kill ourselves before that, trade conflicts have also happened but no mega war, also never implicates conflicts/what happens, no new 1ar impx