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Liberty, as a social good, is well recognized to have a very high social value. The value of liberty, however, also has the nature that it does not lie in itself. That is, liberty must be associated with something else. We usually say freedom of survival, freedom of speech, freedom of fulfilling one's life plan, etc. Or, in general terms, we say freedom of doing or being something. Without this something that one wants to do or to be, liberty itself is an empty abstract idea. Therefore, the function of the principle of liberty is to support a person to obtain some other objects, which the person pursues and which have values for the person.

## Value Criterion: protecting rights
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<https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/1982/5/cj2n1-9.pdf>

Reading Tribe and other critics, one is left with a strong sense that utilitarianism and cost-benefit analysis are flawed — and are to be rejected — because of their callousness towards the individual, his rights, and the processes by which those rights are exercised. ‘‘The notion of human rights,” as Steven Kelman puts it in his recent “ethical critique” of cost-benefit analysis, “involves the idea that people may make certain claims to be allowed to act in certain ways or to be treated in certain ways, even if the sum of benefits achieved thereby does not outweigh the sum of costs.” A right is not something that can be assigned on “efficiency’’ grounds; a right is precisely an individual’s ‘trump’”2 against the claims of efficiency, his protection against social “utility monsters” like the one that recently devoured the Poletown section of Detroit.13 The problem with cost-benefit analysis, we are encouraged to believe, is that, in reducing social questions to the common metric of a homogenized utility, it treats human beings — and their historically rich and idiosyncratic circumstances — with insufficient respect.

# Contention 1: IP protections are rights

## a. IP rights are the basic rights of inventors

**Saha**, C. N., & **Bhattacharya**, S. (**2011**). *Intellectual property rights: An overview and implications in pharmaceutical industry*. PubMed Central (PMC). https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3217699/

Intellectual property (IP) pertains to any original creation of the human intellect such as artistic, literary, technical, or scientific creation. Intellectual property rights (IPR) refers to the legal rights given to the inventor or creator to protect his invention or creation for a certain period of time.[[1](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3217699/#ref1)] These legal rights confer an exclusive right to the inventor/creator or his assignee to fully utilize his invention/creation for a given period of time. It is very well settled that IP play a vital role in the modern economy. It has also been conclusively established that the intellectual labor associated with the innovation should be given due importance so that public good emanates from it. There has been a quantum jump in research and development (R&D) costs with an associated jump in investments required for putting a new technology in the market place.[[2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3217699/#ref2)] The stakes of the developers of technology have become very high, and hence, the need to protect the knowledge from unlawful use has become expedient, at least for a period, that would ensure recovery of the R&D and other associated costs and adequate profits for continuous investments in R&D.[[3](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3217699/#ref3)] IPR is a strong tool, to protect investments, time, money, effort invested by the inventor/creator of an IP, since it grants the inventor/creator an exclusive right for a certain period of time for use of his invention/creation. Thus IPR, in this way aids the economic development of a country by promoting healthy competition and encouraging industrial development and economic growth. Present review furnishes a brief overview of IPR with special emphasis on pharmaceuticals.

## Without this basic right, inventors have no incentive to keep working on new products because they know their ideas can be stolen and they cannot even break even. The aff disregards their rights which devalue their product and ultimately themselves.

# Contention 2: IP protections solve health crises better which turns the aff case

## a. IP protections are key to making new medicine innovations that will save lives

EFPIA. . *Intellectual Property*. Efpia.Org https://www.efpia.eu/about-medicines/development-of-medicines/intellectual-property

IP is the key driver of innovation. It has enabled unprecedented collaborations between biopharmaceutical innovators and governments, universities and other research partners to speed up progress on hundreds of potential COVID-19 treatments, diagnostics and vaccines for patients. It is only because of intellectual property protection that we have over 30o treatments and more than 200 vaccines currently being explored for use against COVID-19.

Fostering a research eco-system that can deliver that innovation rather than undermining it through challenges to IP, is the best way to protect citizens across Europe and around the world.

Every new treatment or cure starts with the spark of an idea. Protecting that spark can involve ensuring funding for early-stage development of a new therapy, it can be creating the right environment for collaboration between research partners, it can be evolving the regulatory framework to keep pace with rapidly advancing science and protecting the spark means having a strong and effective intellectual property framework.

Pharmaceutical intellectual property (IP) – incentives and rewards are the foundation on which innovation is built: they encourage and protect innovation, driving research and development investments into areas of unmet medical need

The framework provides companies researching and developing new medicines the certainty that if a medicine makes it to the market, it will be protected from unfair competition for a limited period time. This is what they need to invest in the long, complex, risky and costly process of delivering new medicines to patients, to healthcare systems and to society. It helps companies turn ideas into assets that address unmet medical needs, improve the lives of patients and their families, create value and also jobs. This, in turn, attracts investment which helps to protect the company’s ideas, retain the knowhow required to convert ideas into therapies, and support further research into the next generation of treatments to improve people’s lives. With over 7000 medicines in development, the system of basic & overarching or targeted incentives is working: it enables a pipeline of this scale despite the high risk of failure.

## b. getting rid of IP protections would make the situation worse

**McMurry-Heath. (2021**, August 18). *Waiving intellectual property rights would harm global vaccination*. STAT. https://www.statnews.com/2021/08/18/waiving-intellectual-property-rights-compromise-global-vaccination-efforts/

Covid-19 vaccines are already remarkably cheap, and companies are offering them at low or no cost to low-income countries. Poor access to clinics and transportation are barriers in some countries, but the expense of the shot itself is not. In fact, if the World Trade Organization grants the IP waiver, it could make these vaccines *more* expensive. Here’s why. Before Covid-19 emerged, the world produced at most [5.5 billion doses](https://www.barrons.com/articles/a-plan-to-break-the-vaccine-manufacturing-bottleneck-51621952245) of various vaccines every year. Now the world needs an additional [11 billion doses](https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-g7-summit---12-june-2021) — including billions of doses of mRNA vaccines that no one had ever mass-manufactured before — to fully vaccinate every eligible person on the planet against the new disease. Even as Covid-19 vaccines were still being developed, pharmaceutical companies began retrofitting and upgrading existing facilities to produce Covid-19 vaccines, at a cost of [$40 to $100 million each](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/healthcare/reports/2020/07/28/488196/comprehensive-covid-19-vaccine-plan/). Vaccine developers also licensed their technologies to well-established manufacturers, like the Serum Institute of India, to further increase production. As a result, almost every facility in the world that can quickly and safely make Covid-19 vaccines is already doing so, or will be in the next few months. The cutting-edge mRNA vaccines from Moderna and Pfizer-BioNTech face an even bigger capacity issue. Since the underlying technology is new, there are no mRNA manufacturing facilities sitting idle with operators just waiting for licensing agreements to turn on the machines. Nor are there trained personnel to run them or ensure safety and quality control. Embedding delicate mRNA vaccine molecules inside lipid nanoparticle shells at temperatures colder than Antarctica isn’t as easy as following a recipe from Bon Appetit. Another big barrier to producing more shots is a shortage of raw materials. Suspending intellectual property protections and allowing any manufacturer to try to produce these vaccines, regardless of preparedness or experience, would increase the demand for scarce raw materials, driving up prices and impeding production. Nor could all companies that suddenly get a green light due to suspended intellectual property rights produce vaccines as cheaply or quickly as existing manufacturers. Building a new vaccine manufacturing facility costs about $700 million, takes many months — if not years — to build and, once opened, requires another [four to six months](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/healthcare/reports/2020/07/28/488196/comprehensive-covid-19-vaccine-plan/) to start producing vaccine doses. And because negotiations surrounding the WTO waiver, which began this summer, could take until December before they are completed, it wouldn’t be until well into 2023 or later that any additional doses would become available. That’s *slower* than our current production rate. According to a report from Duke University’s [Global Health Innovation Center](https://launchandscalefaster.org/covid-19/vaccinemanufacturing), companies are on track to manufacture enough shots in 2021 to fully vaccinate at least 70% of the global population against Covid-19 — the level required to achieve herd immunity.