## 2

### 2NR – UQ O/V

Reconciliation passes now – biden PC is key – he’s been getting more involved on the hill and used his PC to counter pharma lobbying which gets manchin & sinema on board, but increased lobbying tanks discussions.

### 2NR – Link O/V

They HATE the plan – they perceive it as something that destroys their supply chains & doesn’t address any real challenges about distribution and production.

The link independently turns case and kills aff solvency:

[1] Pandemic response – plan kills pharma pandemic responses by destroying supply chains which destroys [medicine] production

[2] Counterfeits – IP reduction causes explosion in counterfeiting which means poor quality [medicines]

[3] manufacturing capacities – aff destroys any possibility of increased capacity bc pharma doesn’t have the means to do it post plan

### 2NR – I/L – O/V

Pharma lashes out against the reconciliation bill through lobbying – they choose it bc it allows Medicare to negotiate prices for prescription drugs which Pharma hates – they view it as a policy that goes hand in hand with the plan which incentivizes retaliation against other Democratic priorities. That independently turns case because only reconciliation can enact effective reform, but the plan means that gets postponed indefinitely.

Additionally, winning a risk of a link should be sufficient for you to vote neg on presumption:

[1] means plan gets repealed – Pharma lobbyists are goated and almost never lose – they own ALL of the key senators needed to pass reconciliation and get the plan over the line – fiat does NOT solve – fiat only means the plan passes, not that it stays forever.

[2] monopolies survive the plan – lobbying independently gets the plan watered down so much that de facto monopolies can still survive which makes their impacts inevitable and means you should vote neg on presumption – Pharma got a republican senator to give up a bill that limits their IP rights, watered down another legislative package aimed at lowering health costs, and always keep lawmakers from landing any IP related punches. The plan is no different – it’s part and parcel of Washington’s “stepped up rhetorical attacks” that doesn’t change Pharma’s influence over Congress.

### 2NR - ! – O/V

Warming outweighs --- it causes extinction --- there’s a ton of internal links --- melting ice sheets, loss of permafrost, Amazon drought, rising sea levels, lethal heat conditions, insect level decline, weather extremes like heatwaves and wildfires.

#### outweighs nuke war

McDonald, 19 writer and geography PhD student at University of Oxford studying the intersection of grassroots movements and energy transition. (Samuel Miller, 1-4-2019, “Deathly Salvation”, *The Trouble*, https://www.the-trouble.com/content/2019/1/4/deathly-salvation)

A devastating fact of climate collapse is that there may be a silver lining to the mushroom cloud. First, it should be noted that a nuclear exchange does not inevitably result in apocalyptic loss of life. Nuclear winter—the idea that firestorms would make the earth uninhabitable—is based on shaky science. There’s no reliable model that can determine how many megatons would decimate agriculture or make humans extinct. Nations have already detonated 2,476 nuclear devices. An exchange that shuts down the global economy but stops short of human extinction may be the only blade realistically likely to cut the carbon knot we’re trapped within. It would decimate existing infrastructures, providing an opportunity to build new energy infrastructure and intervene in the current investments and subsidies keeping fossil fuels alive. In the near term, emissions would almost certainly rise as militaries are some of the world’s largest emitters. Given what we know of human history, though, conflict may be the only way to build the mass social cohesion necessary for undertaking the kind of huge, collective action needed for global sequestration and energy transition. Like the 20th century’s world wars, a nuclear exchange could serve as an economic leveler. It could provide justification for nationalizing energy industries with the interest of shuttering fossil fuel plants and transitioning to renewables and, uh, nuclear energy. It could shock us into reimagining a less ~~suicidal~~ civilization, one that dethrones the death-cult zealots who are currently in power. And it may toss particulates into the atmosphere sufficient to block out some of the solar heat helping to drive global warming. Or it may have the opposite effects. Who knows? What we do know is that humans can survive and recover from war, probably even a nuclear one. Humans cannot recover from runaway climate change. Nuclear war is not an inevitable extinction event; six degrees of warming is.

#### Turns every impact.

Torres, 16 (Phil Torres; author, Affiliate Scholar @ Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, founder of the X-Risks Institute, published articles for Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Salon, Journal of Future Studies, and the Journal of Evolution and Technology; 7-22-2016, "Op-ed: Climate Change Is the Most Urgent Existential Risk," FLI - Future of Life Institute, http://futureoflife.org/2016/07/22/climate-change-is-the-most-urgent-existential-risk/, accessed 8-9-2016)

For example, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the effects of climate change will be “severe,” “pervasive,” and “irreversible.” Or, as [a 2016 study](http://www.climate.unibe.ch/~stocker/papers/clark16natcc.pdf) published in Nature and authored by over twenty scientists puts it, the consequences of climate change “will extend longer than the entire history of human civilization thus far.” Furthermore, [a recent article](http://advances.sciencemag.org/content/1/5/e1400253.full?con=&dom=pscau&src=syndication) in Science Advances confirms that humanity has already escorted the biosphere into the sixth mass extinction event in life’s 3.8 billion year history on Earth. Yet [another study](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html) suggests that we could be approaching a sudden, irreversible, catastrophic collapse of the global ecosystem. If this were to occur, it could result in “widespread social unrest, economic instability and loss of human life.” Given the potential for environmental degradation to elevate the likelihood of nuclear wars, nuclear terrorism, engineered pandemics, a superintelligence takeover, and perhaps even an [impact winter](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impact_winter), it ought to take precedence over all other risk concerns — at least in the near-term. Let’s make sure we get our priorities straight.

#### That turns poverty, nuclear war and pandemics affect the poor first.

#### Warming collapses democracy

Linker, 19 (Damon Linker is a senior correspondent at TheWeek.com. He is also a former contributing editor at The New Republic and the author of The Theocons and The Religious Test, “Will climate change destroy democracy?”, The Week, May 7, 2019, https://theweek.com/articles/839648/climate-change-destroy-democracy)//babcii

Like nearly everyone who hears such conclusions, from do-nothing skeptics on the denialist right to sky-is-falling alarmists on the environmental left, I lack the knowledge or expertise required to assess their accuracy. But let’s assume that the UN study is trustworthy and its quasi-apocalyptic predictions are sound. For the sake of argument, let’s go further and assume that all the recent major reports warning of existential environmental threats due to climate change are accurate: Major world cities inhabited by hundreds of millions of people will soon be under water. Storms will dramatically increase in severity. So will droughts, floods, and famines, spreading suffering across the globe and provoking refugee flows on a scale never seen or contemplated in human history. What kind of politics are we likely to see in such a world? It’s hard to know for sure, but it’s unlikely to be either liberal or democratic. There’s an oddly apolitical character to most of our talk about environmental threats. Environmental activists, climate scientists, and their journalistic popularizers blast the bad news as [loudly and hyperbolically](https://theweek.com/articles/824408/dangerous-addiction-political-hyperbole) as possible, hoping to wake people up to the multitude of dangers confronting us on every side. Meanwhile, policy intellectuals propose myriad ideas for mitigating this or that part of the problem while largely ignoring the challenge of how to get any one of them, let alone all of them, enacted. Neither camp spends much time reflecting on the capacity of our liberal-democratic political systems to respond effectively to the circumstances that confront and await us. One reason why such reflection has been lacking is that it reveals a reality even bleaker than the one sketched in all those studies of the environmental side of the equation. None of the greatest political philosophers in Western history — from Plato and Aristotle on down through Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, and Hume — would be surprised by the lack of resolve on the part of the nations of the world to address global environmental threats. Arguably the problem of politics is getting individuals and groups in a given political community to put aside their own self-interest in favor of the common good. All will benefit in the end, but getting there requires sacrifice. How much sacrifice is just for each? And how can each be persuaded not to free-ride on the sacrifices of others? This was recognized as a problem in the ancient Greek city states, it’s a bigger problem in the much larger and more pluralistic nation states of the modern world, and it's an exponentially greater problem among the “community of nations” in the contemporary world as a whole. It was in part reflection on this problem that inspired Plato to reject democracy as a form of government and instead propose the rule of philosopher-kings — wise leaders who would deliberate and act with the common good in mind at all times. That, for Plato, would be the only way to solve the problem of politics. Whenever environmentally minded activists and pundits express panic and dismay at the inability of the nations of the world to change course to avert disaster, they tacitly acknowledge that Plato had a point: if only they — the environmentally responsible who place the good of the planet above other, narrower considerations — were given overriding political power, the world, and human civilization, might have a chance. That's one way in which the wisdom of liberal-democratic government is being called into question today. As climate change and the collapse of biodiversity accelerates, leading to human suffering and destabilization, the case for keeping political power in the hands of populations that refused to address the problem when it could have made a difference (and that still succumb to bickering when attempting to fashion a response) is likely to decline, creating a hunger for extra-democratic leadership to address the consequences with wisdom and resolution. But let's consider another, seemingly happier possibility: a near-term future in which the nations of the world somehow come to their collective senses and embrace a combination of radical changes in energy production and consumption, agriculture and food production, and population size and growth. As a result, greenhouse-gas emissions, pollution, and other forms of environmental strain begin to recede, allowing the planet and its human inhabitants to reverse course, recover, and avert the worst doomsday scenarios. That sounds delightful — at least until we realize that these changes could only be achieved by the implementation of significant cuts to economic growth. To slow or halt climate change, we need to get smaller — producing fewer offspring, expending less energy, emitting less pollution, consuming fewer resources. This presents its own significant political problem. From the start, modern politics — from classical liberalism on through to more progressive forms of political action like modern liberalism and socialism — have presumed the presence of economic growth and expanding prosperity over time. The promise of material betterment over the course of individual lives and from one generation to the next fuels individual and collective ambition and hope that, in turn, powers the economy. Optimism, hope for the future, faith in progress over time — they are indispensable to keeping our politics decent and broadly democratic. By contrast, when economic pessimism rises, hope for the future wanes, and faith in progress dies out, politics becomes darker, with anger, blame, and bitterness taking the place of contentment. Add in the possibility of economic contraction being paired with the consequences of unavoidable environmental degradation, including refugee flows testing the openness and generosity of the world’s wealthier nations, and we're left with a perfect storm of variables all pointing in the direction of less liberal and less democratic forms of politics. The Brexit vote, the rise of Donald Trump to the American presidency on an anti-immigration platform, the surge of populist parties across Europe in the wake of a spike in refugees from the Middle East — all of it gives us a taste of the political ugliness that may await us. In a world forced to break its addiction to economic growth and the extravagant hopes wrapped up with it, **democracy itself may soon need to be added to the list of endangered species.**
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Independently, try or die neg – infrastructure changes must start now to have a shot at stopping existential climate changes. Warming is incremental – every degree increase in temperature causes different massive impacts which make catastrophe irreversible.

The bill solves climate --- 4 warrants

[1] It implements a clean energy standard that cuts emissions by more than half of what is required by 2030.

[2] It uses tax incentives which cause corporations to shift from fossil fuels to clean electricity

[3] Implements civilian climate corps with rebates and conservation investments that conserve land

[4] Creates the best international model – its both politicized and part of Biden’s broader agenda to set the world on a different climate trajectory.

## Case

On New Arab –

1. If countries don’t support the waiver, then why would they implement methods to reduce IPP even if the waiver goes through. That turns the case.