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## 1

#### **Interp – the affirmative must defend a reduction of IP on a medicine.**

#### **“medicines” treat or cure, whereas vaccines prevent – o/w on specificity since it’s about the COVID vaccine**

Vecchio 7/22 (Christopher Vecchio, [CFA, Senior Strategist,], 7-22-2021, “Delta Variant Concerns Won't Cripple Markets, US Economy“, DailyFX, accessed: 8-9-2021, https://www.dailyfx.com/forex/video/daily\_news\_report/2021/07/22/market-minutes-delta-variant-concerns-wont-cripple-markets-us-economy.html) ajs

Let’s stick to the facts. The COVID-19 vaccines are not medicines, which by definition “treat or cure diseases.” Vaccines “help prevent diseases,” an important distinction. Why does this matter? Because data coming out of some of the world’s developed economies with high adult vaccination rates suggest that the vaccines are working as intended: tail-risks have been reduced, with hospitalizations and deaths falling relative to the recent spike in infections (which have been occurring primarily among the unvaccinated at this point). Put another way, vaccines are like a Kevlar vest for the immune system; while they don’t make you bulletproof, they dramatically increase the odds of surviving an adverse event.s

#### Violation – their advantage area is about vaccines which means either a. they solve nothing and vote neg on presumption because vaccines aren’t “COVID-19 medicines” or b. they violate

#### Negate –

#### 1] Limits – expanding the topic to preventative treatment or medical interventions allows anything from surgery to medical devices to education strategies or mosquito repellent to prevent malaria. Destroys core generics like innovation which are exclusive to disease curing – core of the topic is about proprietary information.

#### Voters:

#### Drop the debater – they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to,

#### Use competing interps reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter,

#### No RVIs –illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance,

Comes first – indicts the 1ac – any potential neg abuse was caused by aff abuse

## 2

#### The United States should:

#### - substantially increase production and global distribution of the COVID-19 Vaccine

#### - cooperate with allies to achieve increased production and global distribution of the COVID-19 Vaccine.

Solves heg – us intervenes in vaccine diplomacy better than the aff bc it looks like follow on w the other wto countries

Solves developing econs – gives them vaccines

Solves credibility – resolves covid which the wto is struggling with

#### That solves better – IP rights don’t hinder vaccine cooperation, but manufacturing capacity is the current constraint.

Hans Sauer 6-17 [(Deputy General Counsel, Biotechnology Industry Organization.) “Web event — Confronting Joe Biden’s proposed TRIPS waiver for COVID-19 vaccines and treatments” https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/210617-Confronting-Joe-Bidens-proposed-TRIPS-waiver.pdf?x91208&x91208] TDI

But contrary to what Lori said, **there are genuine real problems in the supply chain** that are **not caused by patents**, that are simply caused by the unavailability and the constraints on existing capacity. There is in this world such a thing as maxed-out capacity that just can’t be increased on a dime. It’s not all due to intellectual property. This is true for existing vaccines as well as for vaccine raw materials. There are trade barriers. There are export restrictions that we should all be aware of and that we need to work on. And there are very real political, I think, interests in finding an explanation for how we got to this place that absolve governments around the world from their own policy decisions that they made in the past. In the United States, again, it was the declared policy of the previous administration, as well as this one, that we would vaccinate healthy college kids and go all down the line and offer a vaccine to everybody who wants it before we start sharing any with grandmothers in Burkina Faso. That was the policy. You can agree with it or disagree with it, but that was policy. We had export restrictions in place before a lot of other countries did. And that, too, contributed to unequal access of vaccines around the world. Another thing that was predictable was that politicians and governments around the world who want to be seen as proactive, on the ball, in control, for a long time were actually very indecisive, very unsure about how to address the COVID problem, which has so many dimensions. Vaccines are only one of those. But with respect to vaccines, not many governments took decisive action, put money on the table, put bets on multiple horses, before we knew whether these vaccines would work, would be approved. And it was governments in middle-income countries who now, I think, justifiably are concerned that they’re not getting fast enough access, who didn’t have the means and who didn’t have the decision-making structure to place the same bets on multiple horses, if you will, that were placed in the relatively more wealthy, global North and global West. But there is, I think, a really good and, with hindsight, predictable explanation of how we got to this place, and I think it teaches us something about how to fix the problem going forward. **So why will the waiver not work**? Well, first of all, with complex technology like vaccines, Lori touched on it, reverse engineering, like you would for a small molecule drug, is much more difficult if not impossible. But it depends very much more than small molecule drugs on cooperation, on voluntary transfer of technology, and on mutual assistance. We have seen as part of the pandemic response an unprecedented level of collaborations and cooperation and no indication that IP has stood in the way of the pandemic response. **The waiver proponents have found zero credible examples of where IP has actually been an obstacle,** where somebody has tried to block somebody else from developing a COVID vaccine or other COVID countermeasure, right? It’s not there. **Second, the myth of this vast global capacity to manufacture COVID vaccines that somehow exists** **out there is unsubstantiated** and frankly, in my opinion, untrue. But there is no such thing as vast untapped, idle capacity that could be turned around on a dime to start making COVID vaccines within weeks or even months. This capacity needs to be built; it needs to be established. And at a time when time is of the essence to beat this pandemic, starting capacity-building discussions is helpful, but it won’t be the answer to beat this pandemic. It will be the answer if we do everything right to beating the next pandemic. And if we learn any lesson of this, and then I will stop, is that the COVID waiver as well as the situation in which we find ourselves — if anything, it’s a reminder that we definitely have to take global capacity-building more seriously than we did in the past. That is true for the global North, as well as for middle-income countries — all of whom have to dedicate themselves much more determinedly to pandemic preparedness. And there’s a need to invest both in preparedness and in public health systems that hasn’t happened in the wake of past pandemic threats. This is what we will need to do. We will need to reduce export restrictions, and we will need to rededicate ourselves to preparing for the next pandemic. As far as this pandemic goes, **there are 11 vaccines around the world that are already being shot into arms, only four of which come from the global North. How many more vaccines do we want?** I don’t know, maybe 11 is enough if we start making more of them. But there are manufacturers around the world who know how to do this — including in China, including in India, and including in Russia. All developed their homegrown vaccines, apparently without interference by IP rights, right? **So let’s make more of those. I think that’s going to be the more practical and realistic answer to solving the problem**. And we need to lean on governments to stop export controls and to dedicate themselves to more global equity.

## 3

#### Infrastructure passes now with limited corporation support, but increased big Pharma backlash causes it to fail

Waldman 8/31 [Paul, opinion writer for the Plum Line blog. Before joining The Post, he worked at an advocacy group, edited an online magazine, taught at university and worked on political campaigns. He has authored or co-authored four books on media and politics, and his work has appeared in dozens of newspapers and magazines. He is also a senior writer at the American Prospect, “Opinion: Democrats, don’t knuckle under to corporations on the reconciliation bill”, 08-31-2021, Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2021/08/31/democrats-dont-knuckle-under-corporations-reconciliation-bill/]//pranav

The infrastructure bill that passed the Senate and awaits action in the House was in some ways a model of bipartisanship, supported by some Republicans as well as all the chamber’s Democrats, and given a boost from traditionally Republican business groups. That wasn’t a surprise; big corporations need infrastructure to do business. If the government pays for better roads, a more resilient electrical grid and wider availability of broadband, it’ll probably help the bottom line. But what happens when the government suggests addressing Americans’ needs and asks those corporations to help pay for it? This is what happens: A torrent of political groups representing some of the country’s most influential corporations — including ExxonMobil, Pfizer, and the Walt Disney Company — is laying the groundwork for a massive lobbying blitz to stop Congress from enacting significant swaths of President Biden’s $3.5 trillion economic agenda. The emerging opposition appears to be vast, spanning drug manufacturers, big banks, tech titans, major retailers and oil-and-gas giants. In recent weeks, top Washington organizations representing these and other industries have started strategizing behind the scenes, seeking to battle back key elements in Democrats proposed overhaul to federal health care, education and safety net programs. This campaign will have lots of behind-the-scenes pressure: Together, these companies employ a group of lobbyists that are approximately equal in number to China’s People’s Liberation Army — as well as online and TV ads coming to a screen near you. So Democrats should now ask themselves: What are we doing here? As in, why did we decide to run for Congress? Because there are some moments that test your resolve, in which you have to ask what the purpose of public service is, and whether it’s more than just staying in your job for as long as possible. There are disagreements among Democrats about what should be in the final bill, and it’s almost certain that these corporations will have some success in stripping away some provisions they find threatening. There’s an increase in the corporate tax rate (though under every proposal, it would still be less than before the 2017 Republican tax cut). There’s money to boost Internal Revenue Service enforcement of existing tax laws, which the people who run corporations don’t like; an overstretched, overworked IRS that can’t manage to audit the super-rich is just how CEOs like things. Perhaps most threatening is the proposal to allow Medicare to negotiate prices for prescription drugs, as they are currently barred by law from doing. Democrats insist that change would pay for much of the trillions of dollars in new and beefed-up social programs this bill creates.

#### Big Pharma hates the plan – empirics – err neg our ev literally cites their press releases

PhRMA ’21 [The Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA) represents the country’s leading innovative biopharmaceutical research companies, which are devoted to discovering and developing medicines that enable patients to live longer, healthier and more productive lives. Since 2000, PhRMA member companies have invested nearly $1 trillion in the search for new treatments and cures, including an estimated $83 billion in 2019 alone, “PhRMA Statement on WTO TRIPS Intellectual Property Waiver”, 05-05-2021, https://www.phrma.org/coronavirus/phrma-statement-on-wto-trips-intellectual-property-waiver]//pranav

WASHINGTON, D.C. (May 5, 2021) – Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA) president and CEO Stephen J. Ubl made the following statement after the United States Trade Representative expressed support for a proposal to waive patent protections for COVID-19 medicines: “In the midst of a deadly pandemic, the Biden Administration has taken an unprecedented step that will undermine our global response to the pandemic and compromise safety. This decision will sow confusion between public and private partners, further weaken already strained supply chains and foster the proliferation of counterfeit vaccines. “This change in longstanding American policy will not save lives. It also flies in the face of President Biden’s stated policy of building up American infrastructure and creating jobs by handing over American innovations to countries looking to undermine our leadership in biomedical discovery. This decision does nothing to address the real challenges to getting more shots in arms, including last-mile distribution and limited availability of raw materials. These are the real challenges we face that this empty promise ignores. “In the past few days alone, we’ve seen more American vaccine exports, increased production targets from manufacturers, new commitments to COVAX and unprecedented aid for India during its devastating COVID-19 surge. Biopharmaceutical manufacturers are fully committed to providing global access to COVID-19 vaccines, and they are collaborating at a scale that was previously unimaginable, including more than 200 manufacturing and other partnerships to date. The biopharmaceutical industry shares the goal to get as many people vaccinated as quickly as possible, and we hope we can all re-focus on that shared objective.”

#### They lash out against infra and use COVID clout to kill it – they have public support, and a win now postpones reform indefinitely which turns case

Fuchs et al. 09/02 [Hailey Fuchsattended Yale University and was an inaugural Bradlee Fellow for The Washington Post, where she reported on national politics**,** Alice Ollstein is a health care reporter for POLITICO Pro, covering the Capitol Hill beat. Prior to joining POLITICO, she covered federal policy and politics for Talking Points Memo, Megan Wilson is a health care and influence reporter at POLITICO, “Drug industry banks on its Covid clout to halt Dems’ push on prices”, 09-02-2021, https://www.politico.com/news/2021/09/02/drug-prices-democrats-lobbying-508127]//pranav

As Democrats prepare a massive overhaul of prescription drug policy, major pharmaceutical companies are mounting a lobbying campaign against it, arguing that the effort could undermine a Covid fight likely to last far longer than originally expected. In meetings with lawmakers, lobbyists for the pharmaceutical industry have issued warnings about the reconciliation package now moving through both chambers of Congress that is set to include language allowing Medicare to negotiate the price of some drugs, which could generate billions of dollars in savings. In those conversations, K Street insiders say, lobbyists have explicitly mentioned that the fight against the coronavirus will almost certainly extend beyond the current surge of the Delta variant. And they’re arguing that now isn’t the time to hit the industry with new regulations or taxes, particularly in light of its successful efforts to swiftly develop vaccines for the virus. “For years, politicians have been saying that the federal government can interfere in the price of medicines and patients won’t suffer any harm,” said Brian Newell, a spokesperson for the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, or PhRMA, in a statement. “But in countries where this already happens, people experience fewer choices and less access to prescription medicines. Patients know if something sounds too good to be true, then it usually is.” The escalating warnings from the pharmaceutical industry are part of what is expected to be one of the more dramatic and expensive lobbying fights in recent memory, and a heightened repeat of the industry’s pushback to actions by former President Donald Trump to target drug prices. The proposal now under consideration in Democrats’ reconciliation package could save the federal government hundreds of billions of dollars by leveraging its ability to purchase prescription drugs, according to a report from the Congressional Budget Office. Without those funds, Democrats won’t be able to pay for the rest of the health care agenda they’ve promised to voters, including expansions of Medicare, Medicaid and Obamacare. But the plan has political power as more than a revenue raiser. Party leaders — from President Joe Biden to Senate Budget Chair Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) — are touting it as one of the most important components of the $3.5 trillion package, with the potential to lower out-of-pocket health spending for tens if not hundreds of millions of people. Outside advocates have also zeroed in on it as the most consequential policy fight on the horizon. “This is the best chance that we have seen in a couple of decades to enact meaningful reforms to drug pricing policy in the United States that will lower the prices of prescription drugs, and it’s very clear that the drug companies are going all out to stop it,” said David Mitchell, founder of Patients for Affordable Drugs. “This is Armageddon for pharma.” Progressive Democrats and their outside allies believe they’re closer than they’ve been in decades to imposing some price controls, and worry that failure to do so this year will delay progress indefinitely given the possibility of the party losing one or more chambers of Congress in the 2022 midterms. In April, the House passed a fairly aggressive version — H.R. 3 (117) — though a handful of moderate Democrats friendly to the industry have threatened to block it when it comes back to the floor for a vote later this fall. Leadership has largely shrugged off this threat, banking on the fact that the most vulnerable frontline Democrats are vocally in favor of the policy, while most of the dissenters sit in safe blue districts. The Senate is designing its own version, outlined by Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) in June, as a middle ground between HR3 and the more narrow, bipartisan bill he and Sen. Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa) put forward last Congress. A senior Senate Democratic aide confirmed to POLITICO that the bill is nearly complete and that they’re in the process of shopping it around to undecided senators to make sure it has enough support to move forward in the 50-50 upper chamber. “It makes sense to get buy-in before releasing it rather than releasing it with fingers crossed and then tweaking it once members complain,” the aide said. But the reform push is coming at a time when the pharmaceutical industry is working hand-in-hand with government officials to combat the pandemic and enjoying a boost in public opinion as a result, even as drug costs continue to rise. The companies claim that fundamental changes to their bottom line — in addition to the Medicare provision, the reconciliation bill will likely raise corporate tax rate significantly, as high as 28 percent (a jump of 7 percentage points) — will threaten its current investments in research and development at a historically critical juncture. With the final draft of the bill expected in the coming weeks, the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, the lobbying arm of the pharmaceutical industry, is taking its case public. The group has recently spent at least seven figures on ads pressuring Congress not to change Medicare drug policy.

#### Big pharma always wins – independently kills aff solvency bc it causes the plan to be watered down so much that de facto monopolies can survive

Florko & Facher ‘19 [Nicholas Florko is a Stat News Washington correspondent and Lev Facher is Stat News health and life sciences writer, “How pharma, under attack from all sides, keeps winning in Washington”, 07-16-2019, Stat News, https://www.statnews.com/2019/07/16/pharma-still-winning/]//pranav

It does not seem to matter how angrily President Trump tweets, how pointedly House Speaker Nancy Pelosi lobs a critique, or how shrewdly health secretary Alex Azar drafts a regulatory change. The pharmaceutical industry is still winning in Washington. In the past month alone, drug makers and the army of lobbyists they employ pressured a Republican senator not to push forward a bill that would have limited some of their intellectual property rights, according to lobbyists and industry representatives. They managed to water down another before it was added to a legislative package aimed at lowering health care costs. Lobbyists also convinced yet another GOP lawmaker — once bombastically opposed to the industry’s patent tactics — to publicly commit to softening his own legislation on the topic, as STAT reported last month. Even off Capitol Hill, they found a way to block perhaps the Trump administration’s most substantial anti-industry accomplishment in the past two years: a rule that would have required drug companies to list their prices in television ads. To pick their way through the policy minefield, drug makers have successfully deployed dozens of lobbyists and devoted record-breaking sums to their federal advocacy efforts. But there is also a seemingly new strategy in play: industry CEOs have targeted their campaign donations this year on a pair of vulnerable Republican lawmakers — and then called on them not to upend the industry’s business model. In more than a dozen interviews by STAT with an array of industry employees, Capitol Hill staff, lobbyists, policy analysts, and advocates for lower drug prices, however, an unmistakable disconnect emerges. Even though Washington has stepped up its rhetorical attacks on the industry, and focused its policymaking efforts on reining in high drug prices, the pharmaceutical industry’s time-honored lobbying and advocacy strategies have kept both lawmakers and the Trump administration from landing any of their prescription-drug punches. “Big Pharma has replaced Big Tobacco as the most powerful brute in the ranks of Washington power brokers,” Sen. Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) said in a statement to STAT. Durbin, who recently saw the industry successfully oppose his proposal to curtail some of the industry’s patent maneuvering, added that, “Pharma’s billions allow them to continue to rip off American families and taxpayers.” The industry doesn’t get all the credit; it has also benefited from a fractured Congress and discord between President Trump’s most senior health care advisers. PhRMA, the drug industry’s largest lobbying group here, declined to comment for this article. But industry leaders have broadly argued against efforts to rein in the industry’s practices in terms of price hikes and patents, making the case that that could irreparably stifle medical innovation. The battle is far from over, and industry representatives and lobbyists are quick to hypothesize that the worst, for them, is yet to come. They point to several ongoing legislative initiatives, including in the Senate Finance Committee, that could take more concerted direct aim at their pricing strategies in Medicare. They’re waiting, too, to see if House Democrats can cut a drug pricing deal with the White House to empower Medicare to negotiate at least some drug prices. Another pending regulation, loathed by drug makers, might tie their pricing decisions in Medicare to an index of international prices. They’ve also bemoaned the Trump administration’s decision last week to abandon a policy change that would have ended drug rebates — which, the pharmaceutical industry has said, could have given drug makers more space to lower their prices voluntarily. “We’re getting killed!” one pharma lobbyist told STAT. Of course, the Trump administration’s supposedly devastating decision to abandon that proposal simply maintains the status quo. “Big Pharma has replaced Big Tobacco as the most powerful brute in the ranks of Washington power brokers.” n Valentine’s Day, Sen. Thom Tillis (R-N.C.) enjoyed a showering of love that is familiar in Washington: a flood of campaign contributions, many at the federal limit of $2,800 for a candidate or $5,000 for an affiliated political committee. One donation came from Pfizer’s CEO, Albert Bourla, who donated $5,000 to Tillis and another $10,000 to Sen. John Cornyn (R-Texas) and associated campaign committees. Another came from Kenneth Frazier, the top executive at Merck. The Tillis campaign committee eventually cashed checks from CEOs and other high-ranking executives at those companies as well as Amgen, Eli Lilly, Sanofi, and Bristol Myers-Squibb, plus two high-ranking officials at the advocacy group PhRMA. Six lobbyists at one firm that works with PhRMA, BGR, also combined to contribute $100,000 to a bevy of Republican lawmakers and the party’s campaign arms. Tillis raised an additional $64,500 from drug industry political action committees in the past quarter, according to disclosures released on Monday. A Pfizer spokeswoman declined to comment about Bourla’s contributions, and representatives for the other companies did not respond to STAT’s request for comment. Tills was one of few individual lawmakers — in many cases, the only one — to whom the executives had written personal checks during the current election cycle. While drug industry CEOs frequently contribute to political committees for congressional leadership, the breadth of executives who donated Tillis specifically is notable, particularly considering his outspoken role on pharmaceutical industry issues. While lobbyists pushed back on the notion that campaign contributions directly influence votes, the donations targeted so specifically to a particular candidate could be seen as a prime example of Washington’s system for rewarding loyalty and how industries protect their interests. The same PhRMA PAC that donated to Tillis has given generously in recent years: nearly $200,000 in the 2018 campaign cycle, roughly 58% of which was targeted toward Republicans. Drug industry PACs donated $10.3 million in total in that cycle, according to the Center for Responsive Politics. The figure two years before was even higher: a total of $12.2 million from industry-aligned PACs alone. It is no accident that the pharmaceutical industry has maintained its reputation among the nation’s most powerful lobbies, said Sheila Krumholz, the executive director of the Center for Responsive Politics, an organization that tracks political influence. “Their access and influence goes beyond this Congress or even the administration,” Krumholz said in an interview, adding that she “was struggling to think of evidence” it had waned. Pharma has a reputation here for winning on policy — often thanks to the lawmakers who are among the biggest recipients of the millions that drug corporations, employees, and the industry political arms donate each year. Even as the rhetoric has escalated, the industry has quietly worked to insulate itself from any major legislative changes. Take, for example, a recent about-face from Cornyn, the Texas Republican who took in some campaign cash alongside Tillis. As recently as February, Cornyn seemed to be positioning himself as a rare Republican figurehead for anti-pharma congressional wrath. At a widely publicized hearing before the Senate Finance Committee, he went head-to-head with AbbVie CEO Richard Gonzalez, pressing him to explain why the company had filed more than 100 patents on its blockbuster arthritis drug Humira. Cornyn introduced legislation soon after the skirmish to crack down on patent “thicketing,” a term for a drug company tactic to accumulate tens, if not hundreds, of patents to shield a drug from potential generic competition. Pharma sprung into action. They recruited congressional allies, including Tillis, to pressure Cornyn to significantly rework the bill, and they succeeded. The version of the bill that eventually cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee was stripped of language that would have empowered the Federal Trade Commission to go after patent thicketing. Instead, the bill limited how many patents a drug maker could assert in a patent lawsuit. The new version of the bill lost “a lot of teeth” and “solves a narrower problem in a narrow way,” advocates told STAT when the change was first introduced. It is far from the only example of the industry’s aggressive interventions to water down legislation. “In lots of ways they’re like the [National Rifle Association], because they have an incredible power to squash out any negative opinion, nor to feel any of the ill effects of those things,” said Pallavi Damani Kumar, an American University crisis communications professor who once worked in media relations for drug manufacturers. “It just speaks to how incredibly savvy they are.” Pharmaceutical industry lobbyists also successfully fought to keep another anti-drug industry patent proposal from Sen. Bill Cassidy (R-La.) and Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) out of a bipartisan drug pricing package moving through the Senate HELP Committee. The legislation would have allowed the FDA to approve cheaper versions of drugs, even when the more expensive product was protected by certain patents. Cassidy’s proposal never even made it into the HELP package. As the lobbyist who bemoaned the withdrawal of the rebate rule put it, Cassidy “simmered down” in the face of industry pressure. In recent weeks, the industry had targeted Cassidy in particular, in recent weeks, for fear he would break with many of his GOP colleagues to support a cap on some price hikes for drugs purchased under Medicare, a proposal so far pushed only by Democrats. “Sen. Cassidy doesn’t care what lobbyists think — he is going to do what’s best for patients,” said Ty Bofferding, a Cassidy spokesman. “Sen. Cassidy fought for the committee to include the REMEDY Act in the package, despite strong opposition from the pharmaceutical industry.” The committee eventually included half the bill’s provisions, he added, as well as four other pieces of legislation meant to prevent the industry from taking advantage of the patent system. The drug industry also notched a win by watering down another proposal in that package from Sen. Susan Collins (R-Maine) that would have blocked drug makers from suing over patents they didn’t disclose to the FDA. The version of the bill that actually made it into the package doesn’t block drug makers from suing, but instead directs the FDA to create a public list of companies that fail to disclose their patents. “This change is a big win for drug makers,” Michael Carrier, a Rutgers University professor and expert on patent gaming, told STAT. “Shaming is something drug makers don’t seem worried about.” Matthew Lane, the executive director of the Coalition Against Patent Abuse, likewise added that the altered bill “doesn’t seem to be doing much anymore.” Not all of the pharma-endorsed changes, however, are self-serving. Patent experts and federal regulators too had raised concerns with some of the bill being proposed. Cornyn’s patent bill was particularly controversial. “These provisions encourage ‘fishing expeditions’ by zealous bureaucrats, politically motivated by the popularity of efforts to reduce drug prices and garner the political benefits of being seen to be pursuing these ends,” Kevin Noonan, a patent lawyer at McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff wrote in a recent blog post, referring to the original Cornyn bill. Drug-pricing advocates said lobbyists have even managed to convince lawmakers to introduce some legislation they say has explicitly favored the drug industry, including intellectual property-focused legislation that would allow drug makers to patent human genes. That particular bill would “undo the bipartisan effort underway to fix pharma’s exploitation of the patent system,” said the Coalition Against Patent Abuse. And they were far from the only group raising concerns. The American Civil Liberties Union and more than 150 other groups wrote to lawmakers last month opposing the bill. Pharma’s list of policy victories goes on: Drug companies and allied patient groups forced the Trump administration to back off a proposal to make relatively minor changes to Medicare’s so-called protected classes policy. Currently, Medicare is required to cover all drugs for certain conditions, including depression and HIV. The Trump administration proposed in November that private Medicare plans should be able to remove certain drugs in those classes from their formularies, if the drugs were just new formulations of a cheaper, older version of the same drug, or when a drug spiked in price. But drug industry opposition helped convince the administration to spike that effort. A week ago, the industry struck its biggest blow yet. Three of the country’s largest pharmaceutical companies —Amgen, Eli Lilly, and Merck — prevailed in a lawsuit to strike down a Trump administration requirement that they disclose list prices in television advertisements. The lack of congressional action — despite the Democratic enthusiasm and bipartisan appetite — is still further evidence of industry’s ability to stave off defeat. As the dozens of Democrats running for president ramp up their anti-pharma rhetoric, both Trump and progressives have begun to fret that Washington’s efforts have proven to be all bark and no bite. With two weeks remaining before the August recess and an escalating 2020 campaign, some advocates fear that the window for bold action is closing quickly. “It’s appalling that we are six months into this Congress and we haven’t seen meaningful legislation passed on American’s number one issue for this congress,” said Peter Maybarduk, who leads drug-pricing initiatives for the advocacy group Public Citizen. “Congress needs to get its act together.”

#### Infra’s k2 stopping existential climate change – warming is incremental and every change in temperature is vital

Higgins 8/16 [Trevor, Senior Director, Domestic Climate and Energy, “Budget Reconciliation Is the Key to Stopping Climate Change”, 08-16-2021, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2021/08/16/502681/budget-reconciliation-key-stopping-climate-change/]//pranav

The United States is suffering acutely from the chaotic changes in climate that scientists now directly attribute to the burning of fossil fuels and other human activity. The drought, fires, extreme heat, and floods that have already killed hundreds this summer across the continent and around the world are a tragedy—and a warning of worsening instability yet to come. However, this week, the Senate initiated an extraordinary legislative response that would set the world on a different path. Enacting the full scope of President Joe Biden’s Build Back Better agenda would put the American economy to work leading a global transition to clean energy and stabilizing the climate. A look at what’s coming next through the budget reconciliation process reveals a ray of hope that is easy to miss amid the fitful negotiations of recent months: At long last, Congress is on the verge of major legislation that would build a more equitable, just, and inclusive clean energy economy. This is our shot to stop climate change. Building a clean energy future must start now Until the global economy stops polluting the air and instead starts to draw down the emissions of years past, the world will continue to heat up, blundering past perilous tipping points that threaten irreversible and catastrophic consequences. Stemming the extent of warming at 1.5 degrees Celsius rather 2 degrees or worse will reduce the risk of crossing such tipping points or otherwise exceeding the adaptive capacity of human society. Every degree matters. Stabilizing global warming at 1.5 degrees Celsius starts with cutting annual greenhouse gas emissions in the United States to half of peak levels by 2030. This isn’t about temporary offsets or incremental gains in efficiency—it’s about the rapid adoption of scalable solutions that will work throughout the world to eliminate global net emissions by 2050 and sustain net-negative emissions thereafter. Building this better future will tackle climate change, deliver on environmental justice, and create good jobs. It will give us a shot to stop the planet from continuously warming. It will alleviate the concentrated burdens of fossil fuel pollution, which are concentrated in systemically disadvantaged, often majority Black and brown communities. It will empower American workers to compete in the global clean energy economy of the 21st century. There is no time to lose in the work of building a clean energy future.

## 4

#### America’s maintaining hegemony and countering China’s rise through “counter-punching” strategies, but sustained innovation and private sector investment are key – reject “US declining now” args – the US has historically punched over its weight whenever it’s challenged

**Harr 8/3** [Scott, Army Special Forces Officer and Ph.D. Candidate at the Helms School of Government, Liberty University. He holds an undergraduate degree in Arabic Language Studies from West Point and a Master’s degree in Middle Eastern Affairs from Liberty University. A trained Arabic and Farsi speaker with over four years of cumulative deployment time in the Middle East, his work has been featured in The Diplomat, RealClearDefense, The Strategy Bridge, Modern War Institute, Military Review, The National Interest, and Joint Force Quarterly among other national security-focused venues, “By Avoiding Arms Races, America Can Counter China’s Rise”, 08-03-2021, https://nationalinterest.org/feature/avoiding-arms-races-america-can-counter-china%E2%80%99s-rise-191094]//pranav

**Rather than falling into the power projection arms race “trap“ that China desires, U.S. competitive strategies addressing China** should **adopt a framework based on “counter-punching**.” As its name suggests, the counterpunch incorporates both defensive (“counter”) and offensive (“punch”) elements. Additionally, it is an adaptive maneuver that requires disciplined understanding and controlled strength that, effectively employed, offers better alternatives towards protecting and preserving U.S. power in the face of challenges from China. The defensive element of an American counterpunch towards China involves adopting military restraint and a revamped examination of deterrence. Classic deterrence strategy involves presenting the credible threat of force to adversaries to create undesirable risks for would-be aggressors. The key to deterrence, as Kenneth Waltz famously argued, is determining how much deterrence is “enough” to dissuade aggressors. That is, deterrence does not necessarily require the presentation of power projection assets capable of completely destroying an adversary, but only enough assets to make the risks of aggressive behavior not worth the projected losses involved. Seen in this light, a strategy that diligently examines how much deterrence is “enough” potentially eliminates the impulse to sustain the ever-increasing stakes in costly arms races while, critically, **offering a chance to reinvest excess “deterrence” resources into areas that will preserve and protect U.S. power**. The national resources freed up by foregoing an arms race with China represent the potent offensive element of the counterpunch. **These resources can be reinvested in other areas such as the private sector which, besides being the hallmark of American prosperity and thus the critical reason for protecting American power in the first place, has historically played a decisive role in the United States’ successful war efforts**. **Buoyed by a strong and vibrant private sector where the United States remains a desirable global hub for innovation and technology, the needed capabilities for war (or intense competition) can be adaptively produced and rapidly called forward to tip the competitive (or combative) scales towards victory when required.** Of course, the “punch” loses its effectiveness without clearly articulated triggers for employment. If China seeks to induce the United States into an uncontrolled arms race, then the current U.S. obsession with China—which seems to interpret every Chinese action in any sphere as a threat requiring a U.S. response—must be viewed as very encouraging in Beijing. An effective U.S. counterpunch requires clearly defined red lines that regulate and set behavior expectations between great powers and indicate when a Chinese competitive action warrants a U.S. response. Detractors of the counterpunch framework will immediately note the call for military restraint and interpret it as a reactive recipe for military weakness at precisely a time requiring proactive military strength. But military restraint does not imply weakness any more than eating fewer calories implies malnutrition. It simply means making smarter decisions that play to U.S. strengths and away from Chinese strategy. It also entails properly viewing the risks inherent in competition with China. The counterpunch skeptic incorrectly perceives greater risks in short-term military restraint (traded for economic investment and fortification) than in long-term arms races (traded for potential economic collapse). The counterpunch skeptic also fails to appreciate the United States’ historic strengths in adopting this approach. In fact, **America has demonstrated exceptional skill as an adaptive counter-puncher—reacting and adapting to adversity and setbacks to rise above them and create positive effects preserving U.S. power and ideas.** U.S. institutions have counter-punched their way to success in the political (from the failed Articles of Confederation to the Constitution), social (from abhorrent slavery to civil rights), and military (from disastrous Pearl Harbor to WWII victory) arenas to produce the stable and prosperous nation that exists today. As John Mearsheimer points out, **China has the population size and economic capacity (the “sinew of power”) to pose unique and unprecedented challenges to U.S. power**. Additionally, wasteful military exploits—often employed as a means of competing with rivals—have contributed to bringing down world powers again and again throughout history. China understands this apparent axiom and has woven its truth into its competitive strategy to displace the United States as the world’s preeminent power in the twenty-first century. U.S. competitive strategy against China must, therefore, resist the powerful (but seemingly prudent) urge to continually increase the stakes projecting power against China. Rather, the United States needs to adopt a disciplined counterpunch framework focused on protecting and preserving (not projecting) power. This **framework leverages the elements of a successful counterpunch: it demonstrates a superior understanding of adversary strategy (China’s desire to economically exhaust the United States with power projection), it leverages smart defensive elements (adopting only “enough” deterrence to influence China’s actions), and it fortifies conditions of economic strength to ensure offensive actions can be brought to bear when required in competition or conflict (re-investing resources into a globally-leading private sector).** Employing a counterpunch framework asks Americans to trust its institutions—which is a difficult task in the face of a rising China. But the ask is not for blind trust. As a country with less than one-sixth of the world’s population, **the United States as a superpower has been punching above its weight for decades and has historically counter-punched successfully to muster adaptive and superlative responses whenever challenged with adversity. America must follow these historical impulses to remain a superpower in the twenty-first century**.

#### The 1AC’s reduction of IPP for [COVID vaccines] is America “handing over its crown jewels” to competing nations by disincentivizing record setting innovation that causes spillover to other fields and destroys American hegemony.

**Iancu 8/11** [Andrei, American-Romanian engineer and intellectual property attorney, who served as the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office from 2017 to 2021, “Biden is trying to undermine America's world-leading IP protections”, https://m.washingtontimes.com/news/2021/aug/11/biden-is-trying-to-undermine-americas-world-leadin/]//pranav

In May of this year, the Biden administration announced its support for a proposal at the World Trade Organization that would allow other countries to seize American intellectual property on COVID-19 technologies, including vaccines. On cue, those countries promptly modified their ask. **Whereas the original proposal called for the waiver to last a limited number of years, the new proposal makes the waiver effectively permanent.** And why not? **If America is willing to hand over its crown jewels, it might as well demand to keep them forever.** As a former Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, I know that America’s world-leading IP protections laid the foundation for our economic success and technological prowess. And as an immigrant from a communist nation, **I know all too well how disrespect for private property rights undermines innovation and saps economic vitality.** Since the Founding Fathers, Americans have understood that private property extends well beyond land, buildings, factories, and machines. **The real source of America’s power and promise are ideas. Walls, locks, or guards can protect physical property, but the implementation of ideas — new songs, artificial intelligence, or medicines — requires special protections and trust in the rule of law**. That’s why the Founders included intellectual property rights in the Constitution — in the form of an “exclusive right” for authors and inventors — to “promote the progress of science and useful arts.” Indeed, this is the only time the word “right” appears in the Constitution (amendments aside). The Founders knew that only the rule of law, and our respect for it, can protect and enable the development of these ideas. Yet, President Biden undermined that respect by signaling his support for the appropriation of America’s intangible assets. In doing so, he jeopardized America’s uniquely successful intellectual property system. The history of our nation — indeed, much of the history of the world — **since 1789 has been the revolution in knowledge led by American ingenuity in agriculture, industry, medicine, and information technology. Progress like this does not just happen**. Indeed, it didn’t, for the millennia of the entire human history until our nation’s founding a couple of hundred years ago! **It’s not a coincidence that the last two centuries of uninterrupted, IP-driven innovation — up to and including the miraculous creation in a record time of the Covid vaccines themselves — began when one nation finally committed itself to protect intangible assets as much as physical property.** The reason is simple: knowledge is cumulative. **Every new discovery becomes the basis for new research. The revolutionary mRNA technology behind Pfizer and Moderna’s vaccines is, in fact, an evolutionary iteration of previous — patented — breakthroughs over the last two decades.** Sen. Bernie Sanders, among others, turns up his nose at all this science, history, and progress. Like President Biden, he supports waiving vaccine patents because, he says, “We need a people’s vaccine, not a profit vaccine.” **Ignore for a moment that many companies have agreed to sell their vaccines at non-profit prices for the duration of the pandemic, or that the vaccines are completely free for all patients at pharmacies nationwide, or that the federal government pays $19.50 per Pfizer dose, about $15 per Moderna dose, and $10 for the Johnson & Johnson shot — less than the cost of a pizza for medicines that are saving millions of lives and restoring our economy.** Instead, **focus on the fact that intellectual property protections enabled the creation of “people’s vaccines” in the first place.** **The choice isn’t between cheap vaccines and even cheaper vaccines — it’s between shots that are protected by strong IP laws or no shots at all.** The same goes for every industry. **If President Biden doesn’t protect the IP behind new vaccines, investors and inventors will ask, what other technologies are next?** Will similar takings be imposed on climate change technologies, for example? Food processing? Essential semiconductor technologies? **Companies will scale back investments in medical devices, microchips, energy, and everything in between if they think the U.S. Government might waive IP protection after the fact so that others may copy their inventions with impunity.** Of immediate concern is the need for more treatments for Covid-19, especially as the pandemic keeps raging with new variants. **Knowing that their IP may be appropriated as soon as it is developed, private industry — especially start-ups and smaller businesses that depend heavily on outside capital — may not invest the resources necessary to develop these new technologies that are desperately needed right now.** Here’s the reality: **remove patents and other forms of intellectual property, and private-sector investment in innovation dries up**. The government will then try to step in to fill the gap, inefficiently as always. **Like the taking of factories to nationalize industry, this taking of intellectual property is effectively the nationalization of our innovation economy**. The result will be the same as in every other socialist regime that nationalized its industries: the kind of poverty, corruption, and misery that my family escaped from decades ago. **American innovation** has cured diseases, enabled human flight, led to the development of computers, and **made our nation the envy of the world. Waiving intellectual property rights could forfeit it all.**

#### Only U.S. hegemony prevents global instability---alternatives can't maintain peace

**Haass, 17** - President of the Council on Foreign Relations (Richard, "Who Will Fill America’s Shoes?," *Project Syndicate*, 6-24-2017, https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/global-leadership-successor-to-america-by-richard-n--haass-2017-06)

Still, a shift away from a US-dominated world of structured relationships and standing institutions and toward something else is under way. What this alternative will be, however, remains largely unknowable. What we do know is that **there is no alternative great power willing and able to step in and assume what had been the US role**.

China is a frequently mentioned candidate, but its leadership is focused mostly on consolidating domestic order and maintaining artificially high economic-growth rates to stave off popular unrest. China’s interest in regional and global institutions seems designed mostly to bolster its economy and geopolitical influence, rather than to help set rules and create broadly beneficial arrangements.

Likewise, Russia is a country with a narrowly-based economy led by a government focused on retaining power at home and re-establishing Russian influence in the Middle East and Europe. India is preoccupied with the challenge of economic development and is tied down by its problematic relationship with Pakistan. Japan is held back by its declining population, domestic political and economic constraints, and its neighbors’ suspicions.

Europe, for its part, is distracted by questions surrounding the relationship between member states and the European Union. As a result, the whole of the continent is less than the sum of its parts – **none** of which **is large enough to succeed America on the world stage**.

But the absence of a single successor to the US does not mean that what awaits is chaos. At least in principle, the world’s most powerful countries could come together to fill America’s shoes. In practice, though, **this will not happen**, as these countries lack the capabilities, experience, and, above all, a consensus on what needs doing and who needs to do it.

#### Goes nuclear---extinction

Thomas H. **Henricksen 17**, emeritus senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, 3/23/17, “Post-American World Order,” <http://www.hoover.org/research/post-american-world-order>

The tensions stoked by the assertive regimes in the Kremlin or Tiananmen Square could **spark a political or military incident** that might set off a chain reaction leading to a **large-scale war**. Historically, powerful rivalries nearly always lead to at least skirmishes, if not a full-blown war. The anomalous Cold War era **spared** the United States and Soviet Russia a direct conflict, largely from concerns that one would trigger a **nuclear exchange destroying** both states and much of **the world**. Such a repetition **might** reoccur in the unfolding three-cornered geopolitical world. It seems safe to acknowledge that an ascendant China and a resurgent Russia will persist in their geo-strategic ambitions.

What Is To Be Done?

The first marching order is to dodge any kind of perpetual war of the sort that George Orwell outlined in “1984,” which engulfed the three super states of Eastasia, Eurasia, and Oceania, and made possible the totalitarian Big Brother regime. A long-running Cold War-type confrontation would almost certainly take another form than the one that ran from 1945 until the downfall of the Soviet Union.

What prescriptions can be offered in the face of the escalating competition among the three global powers? First, by **staying militarily and economically strong**, the United States will have the resources to deter its peers’ hawkish behavior that might otherwise trigger a **major conflict**. Judging by the history of the Cold War, the coming strategic chess match with Russia and China will prove tense and demanding—since **all the countries boast nuclear arms** and long-range ballistic missiles. Next, the United States should widen and sustain willing coalitions of partners, something at which America excels, and at which China and Russia fail conspicuously.

There can be **little room for error** in fraught **crises among nuclear-weaponized** and **hostile powers**. Short- and long-term standoffs are likely, as they were during the Cold War. Thus, the playbook, in part, involves a **waiting game** in which each power looks to its rivals to suffer grievous internal problems which could entail a collapse, as happened to the Soviet Union.

## Case

### 1AR Theory

You get it but it’s drop the arg & reasonability on 1ar theory

[a]the 2NR must cover substance and over-cover theory, since they get the collapse and persuasive spin advantage of the 3min 2AR,

[b] their responses to my counter interp will be new, which means 1AR theory necessitates intervention.

[c] no infinite abuse – only 7-minute 1nc – getting more efficient solves

### Pandemics

#### Vaccines don’t solve & could drive virus evolution which turns case – adaptation

Gorman & Zimmer ’20 [James Gorman is a science writer at large for The New York Times and the author of books on hypochondria, penguins, dinosaurs and the ocean around Antarctica, Carl Zimmer writes the “Matter” column for The New York Times, “The Virus Won’t Stop Evolving When the Vaccine Arrives”, 11-27-2020, New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/27/science/covid-vaccine-virus-resistance.html]//pranav

Lederberg advised vigilance: “We have no guarantee that the natural evolutionary competition of viruses with the human species will always find ourselves the winner.” With the emergence of what seem so far to be safe and effective vaccine candidates, it appears that humanity may be the winner again this time around, albeit with a dreadful loss of life. But vaccines won’t put an end to the evolution of this coronavirus, as David A. Kennedy and Andrew F. Read of The Pennsylvania State University, specialists in viral resistance to vaccines, wrote in PLoS Biology recently. Instead, they could even drive new evolutionary change. There is always the chance, though small, the authors write, that the virus could evolve resistance to a vaccine, what researchers call “viral escape.” They urge monitoring of vaccine effects and viral response, just in case. “Nothing that we’re saying is suggesting that we slow down development of vaccines,” Dr. Kennedy said. An effective vaccine is of utmost importance, he said, “But let’s make sure that it stays efficacious.” Vaccine makers could use the results of nasal swabs taken from volunteers during trials to look for any genetic changes in the virus. Test results need not stop or slow down vaccine rollout, but if recipients of the vaccine had changes in the virus that those who received the placebo did not, that would indicate “the potential for resistance to evolve,” something researchers ought to keep monitoring

#### Coronavirus won’t get *anywhere close* to existential – low mortality and burnout

Salzberg 20 [(Steven, PhD from Harvard, worked at The Institute for Genomic Research, where he sequenced the genomes of many bacteria, including those used in the 2001 anthrax attacks, also worked on the Human Genome Project, now the Distinguished Professor of Biomedical Engineering, Computer Science, and Biostatistics at Johns Hopkins University), “Coronavirus: There Are Better Things To Do Than Panic”, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/stevensalzberg/2020/02/29/coronavirus-time-to-panic-yet/#7de449ad7fa6>] TDI

1.The mortality rate is probably much, much less than 2%. The rapid spread of COVID-19 suggests that many more people are infected than those who have confirmed cases. The number of people who have no symptoms or very mild symptoms is likely to be ten times as high as the number of reported cases. (This is only a guess.) That would mean the mortality rate might be only 0.2%, or even lower. We still don't know. (The cruise ship that was quarantined in the Japan [had just over 700 cases, and 6 people have died](https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-51677846), suggesting a mortality rate of 1%.)

2.The reported mortality rate is dramatically lower in young people. If you are under 30, you can probably relax a bit. However, if you are over 70, the mortality rate is [frighteningly high, 8-15%](https://www.bbc.com/news/health-51674743).

3.2,933 deaths is a tragedy, but it's a tiny number compared to the annual deaths from the influenza virus, which we have learned to live with. In the U.S. alone, [the CDC estimates that 12,000–61,000 people die each year from the flu](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/about/burden/index.html) (the number varies a lot because the virus itself changes from year to year), and 9-45 million people get sick. The worldwide totals are far higher. So in terms of numbers, the world is definitely over-reacting to the new coronavirus.

#### Kitfield is super old – all of it’s internal links are pre-Biden which resolves divisions, scapegoating & rotting intl system bc Biden’s trying to build it back

Their impact ev is about industry shut down – places are opening up and industries are back to work proves no terminal impact.

#### IP laws are key to prevent counterfeit vaccines which are worse.

**Mercurio 21:** Mercurio, Bryan [the Simon F.S. Li Professor of Law at the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK), having served as Associate Dean (Research) from 2010-14 and again from 2017-19. Professor Mercurio specialises in international economic law (IEL), with particular expertise in the intersection between trade law and intellectual property rights, free trade agreements, trade in services, dispute settlement and increasingly international investment law] “WTO Waiver from Intellectual Property Protection for COVID-19 Vaccines and Treatments: A Critical Review”, *Virginia Journal of International Law Online (Forthcoming 2021),* Feb 12, 2021

The protection of IP not only provides incentives to innovators to create, but also plays a crucial role in ensuring the safety of vaccines and helping to prevent the importation of fraudulent and dangerous goods. Unlike the typical pharmaceutical industry, the vaccine market is not a free and open market.69 Vaccines contain biological products made from living organisms and the risk of failure in vaccine development and production is high. 70 Moreover, the manufacturing process for vaccines is much more complex

as it requires the use of facilities and equipment with a high degree of specialization.71 The complexity of vaccine products implies that more time and regulatory requirements are needed in order to make or “copy” the vaccine production process. Therefore, the innovator should be expected to make conscious and meticulous decisions as to when and to whom to issue licenses, as this is the most responsible way to bring their technologies to the world and safeguard global health. In addition, as the COVID-19 pandemic continues there has been a noticeable increase in the circulation of fake medicines around the world. According to the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol), **organized crime groups have been producing fake drugs and medical products and selling them for lucrative profits in developing countries.72 With the development of COVID-19 vaccines on the market, a rapid rise in the illegal sale of fake items is expected**, according to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).73 Counterfeits of the legitimate products provide false promises of protection and could lead to disastrous consequences, including worsened illness and death for the individual and the retardation of herd immunity for the population at large. Effective and proactive IP procurement is essential and useful in mitigating the risks of counterfeit and substandard medicines. IP enforcement measures play a significant role in preventing these fake and illicit medicines from circulating in the market. While important during normal times, IP enforcement can take on an enhanced role of safeguarding the public during this critical period of time. Waiving all COVID-19 related IPRs raises the risk of unsafe or fake vaccines circulating in supply channels and being sold to unsuspecting governments, putting millions of human lives at risk and reducing trust in vaccines.

Erfani doesn’t have a warrant for increased production – it just asserts it – also claims “no compelling ev” for neg args, but our ev is from former Trade rep who prob knows more

Reuters ev is literally a one line – quote – err neg – better concrete analysis

### WTO

#### Congress doesn’t have the support to pull out now, but more agreements that perceptually favor China changes that

Johnson ’20 [Keith, senior staff writer for Foreign Policy, “U.S. Effort to Depart WTO Gathers Momentum”, 05-27-2020, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/27/world-trade-organization-united-states-departure-china/]//pranav

Frustration with hyperglobalization, China’s “economic imperialism,” and a seemingly broken world trading system is boiling over into serious calls for the United States to withdraw from the World Trade Organization (WTO)—which would have potentially disastrous implications for the country if carried out. For the first time since 2005, lawmakers from both parties and both houses of Congress are pushing to pull the United States out of the trading body it helped create and which was the culmination of decades of postwar efforts to boost free trade and economic integration. By law, the United States has a chance to vote every five years on staying inside the WTO, but staying on board was such a no-brainer in recent years that no such resolution was even presented. But this year—powered by a rise in economic nationalism, growing concern about China, and frustration with two decades of paralysis at the WTO—the knives on Capitol Hill are out, to the delight of some of the trade hard-liners in the White House. “The WTO has been a disaster for the United States,” said Rep. Peter DeFazio, an Oregon Democrat, who introduced House legislation to withdraw this month. “No trade regime can last when it no longer serves the people of the countries who are part of it,” said Sen. Josh Hawley, a Missouri Republican, in a recent Senate floor speech after introducing his own resolution to leave. “Our interests and those of the WTO diverged long ago.” It’s doubtful that the measures could secure enough votes for passage in either chamber, and a tight legislative calendar makes the push for withdrawal doubly hard to pull off. But the rush for the exit is still a serious indication of deep and growing dissatisfaction with how global trade has evolved, highlighted by the vulnerability of cross-border supply chains that have begun to come apart under the stress of the COVID-19 pandemic. If the United States were to pull out of the system it helped build, the implications would be dire. Other countries would be able to discriminate against U.S. goods and services with no limits. Tariffs would almost certainly rise and export markets shrink. Meanwhile, others like China and the European Union would increasingly be in a position to write the rules of the future economy, from data protection and privacy to intellectual property and state subsidies. “We’d have no rights, and we’d lose a seat at the table,” said Wendy Cutler, a former U.S. trade negotiator now at the Asia Society. Why the big push now? For years, different aspects of the global trading system have stirred concern and at times anger in the United States and other countries; the WTO has essentially been stuck in place since the collapse of its last big negotiating round in 2008. For years, economists have debated the impact of the so-called “China shock” on U.S. jobs and manufacturing, and some evidence has shown that the competition from low-wage Chinese labor and the rapid movement of U.S. companies offshore hit the U.S. middle class harder than many economists expected. For years, Republicans have railed against international organizations—from the WTO to the International Criminal Court—that they see as encroaching on U.S. sovereignty. Now, all those forces have come together in a kind of imperfect storm. “I think the confluence of factors—the WTO’s credibility, China’s accession and all the outsourcing, and then the general animosity toward international organizations—they’re all in play,” Cutler said. For proponents of withdrawal, like Hawley, it’s mostly about China taking advantage of an open global trading system to get a leg up on countries like the United States that mostly try to play by the rules. “I think [China] is a principal factor” in the push to leave the WTO, Hawley told Foreign Policy in a recent interview. Beijing’s ability to claim special privileges inside the WTO as a so-called “developing” country, despite boasting the world’s second-largest economy, has powered its rise at the expense of countries like the United States, he said.

#### There’s bipartisan Congressional hatred for the plan – they view it as a giveaway of American tech to China.

Lopez 5/19 [Ian, Senior Reporter @ Bloomberg Law, “China Will Steal U.S. Vaccine IP Via Waiver, GOP Senators Say”, 05-19-2021, Bloomberg Law, https://news.bloomberglaw.com/health-law-and-business/china-will-steal-u-s-vaccine-ip-via-waiver-gop-senators-say]//pranav

Senate Republicans are calling on top Biden administration officials to walk back support of an international plan to waive Covid-19 vaccine IP protections, calling the decision a “giveaway” to China and India that will only promote “vaccine nationalism.” Countries like China that regularly steal U.S. intellectual property began urging the World Trade Organization to waive IP rights “almost immediately after these vaccines were proven to work,” Sens. Thom Tillis (R-N.C.) and Tom Cotton (R-Ark.) wrote in a Wednesday letter to Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo and U.S. Trade Representative Katherine Tai. “These nations are falsely claiming that granting such a waiver would speed the development of new vaccine capacity. Nothing could be further from the truth,” they said in the letter, obtained by Bloomberg Law. Senators d Chuck Grassley (R-Neb.), Mike Lee (R-Utah), and Dan Sullivan (R-Alaska) are among the letter’s backers, according to a Republican staffer. The letter comes amid a heightening debate over whether the U.S.'s backing of a waiver would help expedite global vaccine manufacturing and distribution. “It is not surprising that China, India, and South Africa want to steal our intellectual property and medical technology,” the senators wrote. “What is surprising is that an American president, especially one who claims to be a ‘jobs’ president, would force American companies to give their medical technology and manufacturing processes to foreign adversaries like China.” A proposal before the WTO—set out by South Africa and India last year and supported by dozens of other countries—would waive obligations on the protection of IP rights for the duration of the pandemic. ‘America’s Interests Last’ Key to the debate is whether patents and other IP are an obstacle to global Covid-19 immunization. Proponents of the waiver plan—which include some Democrats and nonprofits—say it’s a step in the right direction, and, taken with other steps like increased manufacturing capacity, could help with faster world vaccination. U.S. support could help get other countries on board with global distribution while spurring efforts to ramp up vaccine production capabilities in nations struggling to immunize their populations, proponents say. Opponents say it’s bad for innovation and does little to get vaccines to those in need while opening the door to IP theft from competing countries. Among those in the latter camp are Tillis, who led a legislative effort to strengthen patent rights; former U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Director Andrei Iancu; and Sen. Chris Coons (D-Del.), who has previously criticized the idea of waiving rights around Covid-19 vaccines. “The reason why there are not enough vaccine doses at this time is simple: the supply chain lacks the technological capacity,” the letter said. “At best, all The President’s giveaway to China and India and others will do is to foster uncoordinated vaccine nationalism, as countries jump in to try to coerce technology transfer and manufacturing locally.” Tai earlier this month announced the Biden administration’s support of the IP waiver, following pressure from a group of more than 100 House Democrats, led by Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-Ill.). Piecemeal IP licensing agreements can’t keep pace with the scope and speed of the pandemic, while temporarily waiving rights could promote technology access and sharing for vaccine production without spurring trade sanctions, they argue. House Republicans quickly followed suit, writing their own letter to Tai in opposition. The senators in their letter posed a series of questions over the details and economic impact of waiving vaccine IP rights. They called for a list and descriptions of all U.S. meetings with foreign officials about the waiver plan. They also asked if the Biden administration is considering waiving domestic IP enforcement, and whether support of the waiver is “premised on China, Russia, South Africa, India, or any other nation state supporting other foreign policy priorities of the Administration,” according to the letter. “Simply put, the Biden Administration’s support for a TRIPS waiver puts America’s interests last and China’s interests first,” the senators said.

#### The US has structurally undermined WTO legitimacy – every WTO ruling gets vetoed

Baschuk 2/22 [(Bryce, reporter for Bloomberg Economics based in Geneva, Switzerland, has been published in Bloomberg, the Washington Times, United Press International and National Public Radio) “Biden Picks Up Where Trump Left Off in Hard-Line Stances at WTO,” Bloomberg, 2/22/2021] TDI

President Joe Biden’s administration dashed hopes for a softer approach to the World Trade Organization by pursuing a pair of his predecessor’s strategies that critics say risk undermining the international trading system.

The U.S. delegation to the WTO, in a statement Monday obtained by Bloomberg, backed the Trump administration’s decision to label Hong Kong exports as “Made in China” and said the WTO had no right to mediate the matter because the organization’s rules permit countries to take any action to protect their “essential security interests.”

“The situation with respect to Hong Kong, China, constitutes a threat to the national security of the United States,” the U.S. delegation said. “Issues of national security are not matters appropriate for adjudication in the WTO dispute-settlement system.”

Prior to 2016, WTO members generally steered clear of defending their trade actions on the basis of national security because doing so could encourage other nations to pursue protectionist policies that have little or nothing to do with hostile threats.

That changed in 2018, when the Trump administration triggered a cold war-era law to justify tariffs on foreign imports of steel and aluminum. In response, a handful of U.S. trade partners, including Canada, the EU, and China filed disputes at the WTO and a ruling in those cases is expected later this year.

Since then, more nations -- including Saudi Arabia, India, Russia and others -- have cited the WTO’s national-security exemption in regional trade fights, leading trade experts to warn that such cases could erode the organization’s ability to mediate disputes.

The Biden administration on Monday said the U.S. has consistently argued that national-security disputes are not subject to WTO review because it would infringe on a member’s right to determine what is in its own security interests.

In spite of the U.S. objection, the WTO granted Hong Kong’s dispute inquiry and will establish a panel of experts to deliberate the matter and render a decision, which could take two to three years.

At the same meeting, the Biden administration said it would not agree to appoint new members to the WTO’s appellate body, a seven-member panel of experts who until 2019 had the final say on trade disputes involving billions of dollars worth of international commerce.

The Biden administration said it could not do so because the U.S. “continues to have systemic concerns” with the functioning of the appellate body as have all previous administrations over the past 16 years.

Though the statement was not entirely unexpected, it confirms America’s bipartisan frustration with the functioning of the WTO appellate body and the new administration’s willingness to block new panelists until changes can be agreed.

Once Katherine Tai is confirmed as the U.S. Trade Representative, her office “looks forward to working with” WTO Director-General Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala to tackle the problems with WTO dispute settlement, including the unresolved issues over appellate-body overreach, USTR spokesman Adam Hodge said in an email. “These are long-standing, bipartisan concerns that we hope our trading partners will work with us to address,” he said.

The Trump administration broke precedent when it refused to consider any nominees to fill vacancies on the panel until there weren’t enough to sign off on new rulings. As a result, the WTO’s dispute-settlement system has been critically damaged because WTO members are now free to veto any adverse dispute rulings by appealing them into a legal void created by the appellate body’s paralysis.

#### Alt causes to WTO disunity

EP 5/20 [(European Parliament, legislative branch of the European Union) “Getting a patent waiver is not enough, says WTO chief to Trade Committee,” European Parliament News: Press Releases, 5/20/2021] JL

She said: “Getting the intellectual property rights waiver for vaccines will not be enough”. She listed three other routes: reducing export restrictions and reinforcing supply chains for vaccines, working with manufacturers to expand production, including in emerging countries with idle capacity such as Indonesia, South Africa, Thailand or Bangladesh, and transferring the necessary technology and expertise to produce the complicated vaccines.

“The IP waiver is a hot issue on which I cannot take sides. But we need more flexibility and automatic access for developing countries, and at the same time we have to protect research and development,” added the head of the World Trade Organisation (WTO).

MEPs also raised questions on trade and sustainability, including the proposed carbon border-adjustment mechanism

and its compatibility with WTO rules.

“I think everything is in the design; its implementation is going to be quite important. But we don’t have that yet, so we cannot say [whether it is compatible], the director-general said.

MEPs asked about the ongoing WTO negotiations over fisheries subsidies that the director-general hopes will be concluded by the end of the year, and about the now defunct dispute settlement mechanism in the WTO.

“We cannot make new rules at the WTO when our system of adjudication on those rules doesn’t work. We need to go to the [Twelfth Ministerial Conference] with an idea for a new system,” Dr Okonjo-Iweala responded to the latter issue, calling for Parliament’s assistance in reaching out to the United States Congress to scout for a common understanding on the Appellate Body.

Dbl bind – inherency true or