# 1NC

## 1

### OFF

#### A. Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions in cite boxes on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki. To clarify, they can’t say check open source, and if cites don’t work, they should have a note saying so.

Debatecoaches no date https://hsld.debatecoaches.org/Main/

A screenshot of a cell phone

Description automatically generated

#### Violation: see the screenshot in the doc

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### 1] Pre-round prep: prep becomes atrocious when you make people sift through 20 word docs to figure out which links you’re reading and which impacts to prep. Discourages tricks—you can just hide a bunch of blippy arguments. Also key for inclusion since disadvantaged people have computers more prone to lag and even 3 or 4 can crash the program for them—outweighs accessibility is a multiplier for their impacts. Disclosing in cite boxes solves—people can quickly get a summary of your position and go to open source if they need more information

#### 2] wiki rules—the wiki tells you to disclose like everyone else. Freeloading is bad and o/w—it cultivates passive citizenship and turns any hope of actually solving their impacts which is a voter for education.

#### Disclosure outweighs – key abuse already happened so it’s lexically prior

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity which requires fair evaluation

#### DTD – a) key to set norms else people can sidestep b) can’t be DTA because we criticize a norm which is you

#### No RVI – its illogical you don’t win for proving you’re fair

#### Competing interps – a) reasonability is arbitrary and bbites judged intervention b) collapses because you gain offense from a brightline with no coutnerinterp offense c) kills norms because we think everything is reasonable and we never find better norms d) footnoting – even if it’s comparatively better norm you don’t vote on it “lets be reasonable this one time” is bad because we never experience norming potential of the shell

## 2

### OFF

#### Your rhetoric of the word “paralysis” is an independent voting issue for ableism – use ‘freeze’ instead. This is perpetuated by their use of this word in 1AC **Murray 17**

**Gent**, PhD – Special Education, **10** [Pamela,– severe disabilities, in Stewart and Webster’s Problematizing Service-Learning: Critical Reflections for Development and Action, p233] cw//az

We have said students are "paralyzed perfectionists" (Higgins 8c Boone, 2003, p. 139), "feel paralyzed, unsure of where to start or what to do," (Maryland Student Service Alliance, 2004, p. 2), "become paralyzed by a sense of impotence, rage, and cynicism" (McNall, 1999), and "are crippled by an amazingly constricted frame of reference" (Barilen, 2003, p. 107). People whose impairments have resulted in paralysis would tell us that their paralysis is not the result of feelings, rage, perfectionism, or their frame of reference. They would also tell us that it is ableist to assume that the type of temporary inactivity suggested in these quotes is in any way similar to their own lived reality. While many of us would question the use of overtly racist or sexist language in our classrooms, we may never have questioned the use of such ableist language.

#### That means you drop them insofar as they’re making the space inaccessible – this also means you should reject the framework on a substantive level because it was justified with flawed logic

#### Reps first

#### 1] controls the form of argumentation – every arg you make is skewed because you justified them with flawed rhetoric

#### 2] prevents debaters from engaging in your arguments – if you’re arguments justify these things, they may be sensitive to debaters who identify with those groups and prevent them from effectively engaging.

#### 3] reps shape reality because we only understand arguments through how they’re conveyed, just like you won’t vote on an argument you don’t understand.

## 3

### Framework

#### The meta-ethic is procedural moral realism - substantive realism holds that moral truths exist independently of that in the empirical world. Prefer –

#### [1] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents which makes it action guiding

#### [2] Naturalistic fallacy – experience only tells us what is since we can only perceive what is, not what ought to be, this means experience may be generally useful but should not be the basis for ethical action.

#### Practical Reason is that procedure. To ask for why we should be reasoners concedes its authority since it uses reason – anything else is nonbinding and arbitrary which is the problem of regress. Aggregation is nonsensical since a] it impedes on one persons ends for another and b] assumes everyone values the same thing.

#### Moral law must be universal—our judgements can’t only apply to ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me – any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends.

Korsgaard ’83 (Christine M., “Two Distinctions in Goodness,” The Philosophical Review Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 169-195, JSTOR) // LEX JB [brackets for gendered language]

The argument shows how Kant's idea of justification works. It can be read as a kind of regress upon the conditions, starting from an important assumption. The assumption is that **when a rational being makes a choice or undertakes an action, [they] supposes the object to be good, and its pursuit to be justified**. At least, if there is a categorical imperative there must be objectively good ends, for then there are necessary actions and so necessary ends (G 45-46/427-428 and Doctrine of Virtue 43-44/384-385). **In order for there to be any objectively good ends, however, there must be something that is unconditionally good and so can serve as a sufficient condition of their goodness**. Kant considers what this might be**: it cannot be an object of inclination**, for those have only a conditional worth, "**for if the inclinations and the needs founded on them did not exist, their object would be without worth**" (G 46/428). It cannot be the inclinations themselves because a rational being would rather be free from them. Nor can it be external things, which serve only as means. So, Kant asserts, **the unconditionally valuable thing must be "humanity"** or "rational nature," which he defines as "the power set to an end" (G 56/437 and DV 51/392). Kant explains that **regarding your existence as a rational being as an end in itself is a "subjective principle of human action."** By this I understand him to mean that **we must regard ourselves as capable of** conferring **value upon the objects of our choice, the ends that we set, because we must regard our ends as good**. But since "every other rational being thinks of his existence by the same rational ground which holds also for myself' (G 47/429), **we must regard others as capable of conferring value by reason of their rational choices and so also as ends in themselves**. Treating another as an end in itself thus involves making that person's ends as far as possible your own (G 49/430). The ends that are chosen by any rational being, possessed of the humanity or rational nature that is fully realized in a good will, take on the status of objective goods. They are not intrinsically valuable, but they are objectively valuable in the sense that every rational being has a reason to promote or realize t hem. For this reason it is our duty to promote the happiness of others-the ends that they choose-and, in general, to make the highest good our end.

**The standard is consistency with the categorical imperative. To clarify, consequences don’t link to the framework.**

#### Prefer additionally –

#### [1] Kantianism is the best explanatory theory for oppression through abstracting through ethical egoism.

Farr 02 [Arnold (prof of phil @ UKentucky, focusing on German idealism, philosophy of race, postmodernism, psychoanalysis, and liberation philosophy). “Can a Philosophy of Race Afford to Abandon the Kantian Categorical Imperative?” JOURNAL of SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, Vol. 33 No. 1, Spring 2002, 17–32 // LEX JB]

**One of the most popular criticisms of Kant’s** moral philosophy is that it is too formalistic.13 That is, the universal nature of the categorical imperative leaves it devoid of content. Such a principle is useless since moral decisions are made by concrete individuals in a concrete, historical, and social situation. This type of criticism lies behind Lewis Gordon’s rejection of any attempt to ground an antiracist position on Kantian principles. The rejection of universal principles for the sake of emphasizing the historical embeddedness of the human agent is widespread in recent philosophy and social theory. I will argue here on Kantian grounds that although a distinction between the **universal and the concrete is a valid distinction, the unity of the two is required** for an understanding of human agency. The attack on Kantian formalism began with Hegel’s criticism of the Kantian philosophy.14 The list of contemporary theorists who follow Hegel’s line of criticism is far too long to deal with in the scope of this paper. Although these theorists may approach the problem of Kantian formalism from a variety of angles, the spirit of their criticism is basically the same: The universality of the categorical imperative is an abstraction from one’s empirical conditions. Kant is often accused of making the moral agent an abstract, empty, noumenal subject. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Kantian subject is an embodied, empirical, concrete subject. However, this concrete subject has a dual nature. Kant claims in the Critique of Pure Reason as well as in the Grounding that human beings have an intelligible and empirical character.15 It is impossible to understand and do justice to Kant’s moral theory without taking seriously the relation between these two characters. The very concept of morality is impossible without the tension between the two. By “empirical character” Kant simply means that we have a sensual nature. We are physical creatures with physical drives or desires. The very fact that **I cannot simply satisfy my desires without considering the rightness or wrongness of my actions suggests that my empirical character must be held in check** by something, or else I behave like a Freudian id. My empiri- cal character must be held in check by my intelligible character, which is the legislative activity of practical reason. **It is through our intelligible character that we formulate principles that keep our empirical impulses in check. The categorical imperative is the supreme principle of morality that is constructed by the moral agent in his/her moment of self-transcendence.** What I have called self-transcendence may be best explained in the following passage by Onora O’Neill: In restricting our maxims to those that meet the test of the categorical imperative we refuse to base our lives on maxims that necessarily make our own case an exception. The reason why a universilizability criterion is morally signiﬁcant is that it makes our own case no special exception (G, IV, 404). In accepting the Categorical Imperative we accept the moral reality of other selves, and hence the possibility (not, note, the reality) of a moral community. **The Formula of Universal Law enjoins no more than that we act only on maxims that are open to others also**.16 O’Neill’s description of the universalizability criterion includes the notion of self-transcendence that I am working to explicate here to the extent that like self-transcendence, universalizable moral principles require that the individ- ual think beyond his or her own particular desires. **The individual is not allowed to exclude others as rational moral agents who have the right to act as he acts in a given situation.** For example, if I decide to use another person merely as a means for my own end I must recognize the other person’s right to do the same to me. I cannot consistently will that I use another as a means only and will that I not be used in the same manner by another. Hence, the universalizability criterion is a principle of consistency and a principle of inclusion. That is, in choosing my maxims I attempt to include the perspective of other moral agents. … Whereas most criticisms are aimed at the formulation of universal law and the formula of autonomy, our analysis here will focus on the formula of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends, since we have already addressed the problem of universality. The latter will be discussed ﬁrst. At issue here is what Kant means by “kingdom of ends.” Kant writes: “By ‘kingdom’ I understand a systematic union of different rational beings through common laws.”32 The above passage indicates that Kant recognizes different, perhaps different kinds, of rational beings; however, the problem for most critics of Kant lies in the assumption that Kant suggests that the “kingdom of ends” requires that we abstract from personal differences and content of private ends. The Kantian conception of rational beings requires such an abstraction. Some feminists and philosophers of race have found this abstract notion of rational beings problematic because they take it to mean that rationality is necessarily white, male, and European.33 Hence, the systematic union of rational beings can mean only the systematic union of white, European males. I ﬁnd this interpretation of Kant’s moral theory quite puzzling. Surely another interpretation is available. That is, the implication that in Kant’s philosophy, rationality can only apply to white, European males does not seem to be the only alternative. The problem seems to lie in the requirement of abstraction. There are two ways of looking at the abstraction requirement that I think are faithful to Kant’s text and that overcome the criticisms of this requirement. **First, the abstraction requirement may be best understood as a demand for intersubjectivity or recognition. Second, it may be understood as an attempt to avoid ethical egoism in determining maxims for our actions.** It is unfortunate that Kant never worked out a theory of intersubjectivity, as did his successors Fichte and Hegel. However, this is not to say that there is not in Kant’s philosophy a tacit theory of intersubjectivity or recognition. The abstraction requirement simply demands that in the midst of our concrete differences we recognize ourselves in the other and the other in ourselves. That is, we recognize in others the humanity that we have in common. Recognition of our common humanity is at the same time recognition of rationality in the other. We recognize in the other the capacity for selfdetermination and the capacity to legislate for a kingdom of ends. This brings us to the second interpretation of the abstraction requirement. **To avoid ethical egoism one must abstract from (think beyond) one’s own personal interest and subjective maxims. That is, the categorical imperative requires that I recognize that I am a member of the realm of rational beings.** Hence, I organize my maxims in consideration of other rational beings. Under such a principle other people cannot be treated merely as a means for my end but must be treated as ends in themselves. **The merit of the categorical imperative for a philosophy of race is that it contravenes racist ideology to the extent that racist ideology is based on the use of persons of a different race as a means to an end rather than as ends in themselves.** Embedded in the formulation of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends is the recognition of the common hope for humanity. That is, maxims ought to be chosen on the basis of an ideal, a hope for the amelioration of humanity. This ideal or ethical commonwealth (as Kant calls it in the Religion) is the kingdom of ends.34 Although the merits of Kant’s moral theory may be recognizable at this point, we are still in a bit of a bind. It still seems problematic that the moral theory of a racist is essentially an antiracist theory. Further, what shall we do with Henry Louis Gates’s suggestion that we use the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime to deconstruct the Grounding? What I have tried to suggest is that instead of abandoning the categorical imperative we should attempt to deepen our understanding of it and its place in Kant’s critical philosophy. A deeper reading of the Grounding and Kant’s philosophy in general may produce the deconstruction35 suggested by Gates. However, a text is not necessarily deconstructed by reading it against another. Texts often deconstruct themselves if read properly. To be sure, the best way to understand a text is to read it in context. Hence, if the Grounding is read within the context of the critical philosophy, the tools for a deconstruction of the text are provided by its context and the tensions within the text. Gates is right to suggest that the Grounding must be deconstructed. However, this deconstruction requires much more than reading the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime against the Grounding. It requires a complete engagement with the critical philosophy. Such an engagement discloses some of Kant’s very signiﬁcant claims about humanity and the practical role of reason. With this disclosure, deconstruction of the Grounding can begin. **What deconstruction will reveal is not necessarily the inconsistency of Kant’s moral philosophy or the racist or sexist nature of the categorical imperative, but rather, it will disclose the disunity between Kant’s theory and his own feelings about blacks and women. Although the theory is consistent and emancipatory and should apply to all persons, Kant the man has his own personal and moral problems. Although Kant’s attitude toward people of African descent was deplorable, it would be equally deplorable to reject the categorical imperative without ﬁrst exploring its emancipatory potential.**

#### [2] Accessibility – Analytical philosophy means anyone can generate offense under the framework with analytics without evidence – util disproportionately favors evidence-based debate which is what big schools with coaching staffs have which kills small school engagement

### Offense

#### [1] Intellectual property is part of our metaphysical construction that preserves agency – anything else robs us of innate property

Pozzo 06 [Riccardo Pozzo, Immanuel Kant sobre propriedade intelectual. Trans/Form/Ação, (São Paulo), v.29(2), 2006, p.11-18, <https://www.scielo.br/j/trans/a/rLfb3yPN3p4KPsYpxp8LQCp/?format=pdf&lang=en> // JB]

The peculiarity of **intellectual property consists** thus **first in being indeed a property**, but property **of an action; and** **second** in **being** indeed **inalienable, but also transferable in commission** and license to a publisher. **The bond the author has on** his **work confers** him a **moral right that is indeed a personal right. It is** also a **right to exploit** economically his **work in all possible ways**, a right of **economic use, which is a patrimonial right. Kant** and Fichte **argued** that **moral right** and the right **of economic use are** strictly **connected**, and **that the offense** to one **implies inevitably offense to the other**. In eighteenth-century Germany, **the free use came into discussion among** the presuppositions of a democratic renewal of state and society. In his Supplement to the Consideration of Publishing and Its Rights, Reimarus asked writers “instead of writing for the aristocracy, to write for the tiers état of the reader’s world.” (Reimarus, 1791b, p.595). He saluted with enthusiasm the claim of disenfranchising from the monopoly of English publishers expressed in the American Act for the Encouragement of Learning of May 31, 1790. **Kant**, however, **was firm in embracing intellectual property**. Referring himself to Roman Law, he asked for its legislative formulation not only as patrimonial right, but also as a personal right. In **Of the Illegitimity of Pirate Publishing, he considered** the **moral faculties related to intellectual property as an “inalienable right** (ius personalissimum) **always himself to speak through anyone else, the right, that is, that no one may deliver the same speech to the public other than in his (the author’s) name”** (Kant, 1902, t.8, p.85). Fichte went farther in the Demonstration of the Illegitimity of Pirate Publishing. **He saw intellectual property as a part of his metaphysical construction of intellectual activity**, which was based on the principle that thoughts “are not transmitted hand to hand, **they are not paid with shining cash, neither are they transmitted to us if we take home the book that contains them and put it into our library**. In order **to make those** thoughts **our own an action is still missing: we must read the book, meditate – provided it is not completely trivial – on its content, consider it under different aspects and eventually accept it within our connections of ideas**” (Fichte, 1964, t.I/1, p.411).

#### Means the state can’t remove protections.

Zeidman et al. 2 [Bob Zeidman &amp; Eashan Gupta, "Why Libertarians Should Support a Strong Patent System", IPWatchdog, 1-5-2016, https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2016/01/05/why-libertarians-should-support-a-strong-patent-system/id=64438/, accessed: 8-9-2021.] //Lex VM

Libertarians believe in property rights and government protection of those rights as one of the few necessary requirements of government. Ownership of property and free markets leads to competitive production and trade of goods, which in turn leads to prosperity for all of society. Intellectual property is property like other forms of property, and so government must protect IP as it protects other forms of property because it too leads to competition and trade and prosperity. Libertarians should encourage a strong patent system and object to any “reforms” that limit intellectual property ownership or introduce more government regulation than is required.

#### 2] Reducing protections of IP leads to theft and the free riding of ideas which is nonuniversalizable

Van Dyke 18 [Raymond Van Dyke, Technology and Intellectual Property Attorney and Patent Practitioner, 7-17-2018, accessed on 8-8-2021, IPWatchdog, "The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting", https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/] //D.Ying recut Lex VM

As we shall see, applying Kantian logic entails first acknowledging some basic principles; that the people have a right to express themselves, that that expression (the fruits of their labor) has value and is theirs (unless consent is given otherwise), and that government is obligated to protect people and their property. Thus, an inventor or creator has a right in their own creation, which cannot be taken from them without their consent. So, employing this canon, a proposed Categorical Imperative (CI) is the following Statement: creators should be protected against the unlawful taking of their creation by others. Applying this Statement to everyone, i.e., does the Statement hold water if everyone does this, leads to a yes determination. Whether a child, a book or a prototype, creations of all sorts should be protected, and this CI stands. This result also dovetails with the purpose of government: to protect the people and their possessions by providing laws to that effect, whether for the protection of tangible or intangible things. However, a contrary proposal can be postulated: everyone should be able to use the creations of another without charge. Can this Statement rise to the level of a CI? This proposal, upon analysis would also lead to chaos. Hollywood, for example, unable to protect their films, television shows or any content, would either be out of business or have robust encryption and other trade secret protections, which would seriously undermine content distribution and consumer enjoyment. Likewise, inventors, unable to license or sell their innovations or make any money to cover R&D, would not bother to invent or also resort to strong trade secret. Why even create? This approach thus undermines and greatly hinders the distribution of ideas in a free society, which is contrary to the paradigm of the U.S. patent and copyright systems, which promotes dissemination. By allowing freeriding, innovation and creativity would be thwarted (or at least not encouraged) and trade secret protection would become the mainstay for society with the heightened distrust. Also, allowing the free taking of ideas, content and valuable data, i.e., the fruits of individual intellectual endeavor, would disrupt capitalism in a radical way. The resulting more secretive approach in support of the above free-riding Statement would be akin to a Communist environment where the State owned everything and the citizen owned nothing, i.e., the people “consented” to this. It is, accordingly, manifestly clear that no reasonable and supportable Categorical Imperative can be made for the unwarranted theft of property, whether tangible or intangible, apart from legitimate exigencies. On the positive front, there is a Categorical Imperative that creators should be encouraged to create, which is imminently reasonable and supportable. Likewise, the statement set forth in the Constitution that Congress should pass laws “To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries” is supportive, as a Categorical Imperative, for the many reasons elucidated two centuries ago by Madison and others, and endorsed by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and later by Abraham Lincoln. A Categorical Imperative, universality, however, may be a stretch outside of the United States since other cultures may not treasure the progress of science and the useful arts and freedoms that we Americans do. Nonetheless, it is certainly a supportable proposition in the United States, and even a Categorical Imperative that we must do it!

#### 3] No aff solvency for turns – the aff reduces protections rather than eliminating them which still allows for freedom violations – Presume neg. Also, neg contention choice – otherwise they can concede all our work on framework and moot half my speechtime and sidestep all phil clash in the round

## 4

### OFF

#### A. Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than “The member nations of the world trade organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines,” then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)*

#### B. Violation: they don’t – they say united states and other countries shouldn’t do the plan

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair –

#### a) Ground – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer I can’t be expected to

#### b) Limits – Operating outside the bounds of the general maxim places an infinite research burden explodes neg prep

#### 2. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Having one also encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.

## Case

### OV

#### Waiver greenlights counterfeit medicine – turns case.

Conrad 5-18 John Conrad 5-18-2021 "Waiving intellectual property rights is not in the best interests of patients" <https://archive.is/vsNXv#selection-5353.0-5364.0> (president and CEO of the Illinois Biotechnology Innovation Organization in Chicago.)//Elmer

The Biden's administration's support for India and South Africa's proposal before the World Trade Organization to temporarily waive anti-COVID vaccine patents to boost its supply will fuel the **development of counterfeit vaccines and weaken the already strained global supply chain**. The proposal will not increase the effective number of COVID-19 vaccines in India and other countries. The manufacturing standards to produce COVID-19 vaccines are **exceptionally complicated**; it is unlike any other manufacturing process. To ensure patient safety and efficacy, only manufacturers with the **proper facilities and training should produce the vaccine, and they are**. Allowing a temporary waiver that permits compulsory licensing to allow a manufacturer to export counterfeit vaccines will **cause confusion and endanger public health**. For example, between 60,000 and 80,000 children in Niger with fatal falciparum malaria were treated with a counterfeit vaccine containing incorrect active pharmaceutical ingredients, resulting in more than **100 fatal infections.** Beyond the patients impacted, counterfeit drugs erode public confidence in health care systems and the pharmaceutical industry. Vaccine hesitancy is a rampant threat that feeds off of the distribution of misinformation. Allowing the production of vaccines from improper manufacturing facilities further opens the door for antivaccine hacks to stoke the fear fueling **vaccine hesitance**.

### Adv 1

#### [1] No solvency evidence – doesn’t say that eliminating enforcement will increase vaccine access in those specific countries

#### [2] Squo solves –

Keith, 21, Biden Says U.S. Leads The World In Vaccine Donations — And Promises More, https://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2021/08/03/1023822839/biden-is-sending-110-million-vaccines-to-nations-in-need-thats-just-a-first-step, NPR.org,

The U.S. has delivered 110 million COVID-19 vaccine doses to 65 countries, from Afghanistan to Zambia, President Biden announced Tuesday at the White House. The U.S. donations prove that "democracies can deliver," Biden said. He added that the U.S. has acquired another 500 million Pfizer vaccines that will be donated to low- and middle-income countries by the end of the month, emphasizing that global vaccination is essential: "You can't build a wall high enough to keep us safe from COVID in other countries."

### Adv 2

#### IP Protections are key to the pharma sector – strong innovation solves future pandemics – that lowers the price of contraceptives

**Wilbur 20** [Tom Wilbur, Tom Wilbur is Director of Public Affairs at PhRMA focusing on message development and opinion research. Prior to joining PhRMA in 2019, Tom worked on Capitol Hill and on political campaigns for nearly a decade, most recently responsible for communications, campaigns and strategy for U.S. Rep. Fred Upton and the House Energy and Commerce Committee. 5-4-2020, accessed on 8-3-2021, Catalyst.phrma.org, "What they are saying: Intellectual property protections are critical as we work to defeat COVID-19", <https://catalyst.phrma.org/what-they-are-saying-intellectual-property-protections-are-critical-as-we-work-to-defeat-covid-19>] Adam

The U.S. biopharmaceutical industry depends on reliable intellectual property (IP) protections to promote the development of new breakthrough treatments and cures for patients. Strong IP protections are especially important while biopharmaceutical companies work around the clock to develop solutions to help prevent infection and treat those with COVID-19, a disease cause by the novel strain of coronavirus. In fact, many of the existing medicines and investigational medicines being tested for COVID-19 exist today because of IP and other incentives that drove their research and development.

Here is a closer look at recent comments spotlighting how strong IP protections help fuel discovery efforts for COVID-19 treatments and vaccines:

“The world has placed its profound confidence in the free enterprise of the leading scientists and innovators to reach as many solutions as possible in the shortest amount of time. It is obviously a heavy weight for researchers to bear, but not a burden…Removing the ability of these first responders to own their work while they are in the process, or after completion, undermines their efforts. Keeping these rights intact not only allows more knowledge-sharing in the fight against COVID-19 but also ensures long-term research to ready the fight against the next pandemic, as well.” – Philip Thomas, policy analyst at the Property Rights Alliance, in [Morning Consult](https://morningconsult.com/opinions/fighting-covid-19-doesnt-require-selling-out-our-innovation-ecosystem/)

“Good patent policy incentivizes inventors to find solutions, not merely for today’s, but for tomorrow’s problems… America’s biomedical innovators have assumed the risk of costly dead ends along the long, bumpy road to developing a successful drug, device or test that addresses COVID-19. They’ve shouldered this burden in good faith in a no-holds-barred race on all fronts — diagnostics, ventilators, personal protective equipment, therapeutics and vaccines. For many, the IP exclusivity over the terms of their patents will help offset R&D costs eaten now.” – James Edwards, IP consultant and Gene Quinn, President and CEO of IP Watchdog Inc., in [IP Watchdog](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2020/04/08/facilitating-innovation-to-fight-coronavirus-act-legislation-mixed-bag/id=120483/)

“The Bayh-Dole Act represents one of the bedrock policies that has helped make the U.S. biomedical innovation system the envy of the world and a key place the world is now turning to in the search for an accessible coronavirus vaccine or treatment. Those who would misguidedly interpret Bayh-Dole march-in-rights as a price-control provision that could be leveraged in the coronavirus case or other circumstances advocate for an approach that threatens to seriously deter biomedical innovation and undermine a key pillar of America’s biomedical innovation system.” – Stephen Ezell, vice president for global innovation policy at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, in [Morning Consult](https://morningconsult.com/opinions/how-bayh-dole-act-facilitates-development-coronavirus-therapies/)

“The appropriate intellectual property framework is enabling the rapid R&D response. Many potential treatments are based on decades of prior R&D and investment or originally were pioneered to treat other conditions. These breakthroughs were enabled by a robust innovation eco-system underpinned by effective IP.” – Oscar Guinea, senior economist at the European Centre for International Political Economy and Koen Berden, executive director of international trade at the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations in [EFPIA News](https://www.efpia.eu/news-events/the-efpia-view/blog-articles/trade-policy-and-covid-19-openness-and-cooperation-in-times-of-a-pandemic/)