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### 1

#### Interpretation: “medicines” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend a subset of medicines member nations reduce IPP for.

Nebel 19. [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution.” Vbriefly. August 12, 2019. <https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/?fbclid=IwAR0hUkKdDzHWrNeqEVI7m59pwsnmqLl490n4uRLQTe7bWmWDO_avWCNzi14> TG

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions. Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window. So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why. “Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons. First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural. Second, “colleges and universities” fails the [upward-entailment test](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#IsolGeneInte) for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals. Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universities generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution.

#### It applies to “medicines” – 1] upward entailment test – “member nations ought to reduce IPP for medicines” doesn’t entail “member nations ought to reduce IPP for consumables” cuz IPP on food would remain, 2] adverb test – adding “usually” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning

#### Violation – they only defend reducing IPR on Insulin .

#### Vote neg –

#### [1] Precision – the counter-interp justifies them doing away with random words in the resolution which decks neg ground and prep because the aff is not bounded by the resolution. Voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t can’t vote aff if there wasn’t a legit aff.

#### [2] Limits – you can pick one out of hundred of nations and there’s no universal DA since each state has a different political situation – it explodes neg prep which makes cutting stable neg links impossible – limits outweighs – we have to prep every aff while they only need to prep one which is a structural skew

#### [3] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff. PICs don’t solve – to say neg potential abuse justifies the aff being not T leads to a race towards abuse.

#### Fairness is a voter – all arguments concede the validity of fairness insofar as you assume the judge will fairly evaluate them

#### T is DTD – their advocacy skewed the debate from the start

#### Use competing interps – (a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, (b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 bright lines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs— (a) logic (b) baiting (c) topic education

### 2

#### Biotech industry strong now – new innovation and R&D coming

Cancherini et al. 4/30 [Laura, Engagement Manager @ McKinsey & Company, Joseph Lydon, Associate Partner @ McKinsey & Company, Jorge Santos Da Silva, Senior Partner at McKinsey & Company, and Alexandra Zemp, Partner at McKinsey & Company] “What’s ahead for biotech: Another wave or low tide?“, McKinsey & Company, 4-30-2021, <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/whats-ahead-for-biotech-another-wave-or-low-tide> //ajs

As the pandemic spread across the globe in early 2020, biotech leaders were initially pessimistic, reassessing their cash position and financing constraints. When McKinsey and BioCentury interviewed representatives from 106 biotech companies in May 2020,4 half of those interviewed were expecting delays in financing, and about 80 percent were tight on cash for the next two years and considering trade-offs such as deferring IPOs and acquisitions. Executives feared that valuations would decline because of lower revenue projections and concerns about clinical-trial delays, salesforce-effectiveness gaps, and other operational issues. Belying this downbeat mood, biotech has in fact had one of its best years so far. By January 2021, venture capitalists had invested some 60 percent more than they had in January 2020, with more than $3 billion invested worldwide in January 2021 alone.5 IPO activity grew strongly: there were 19 more closures than in the same period in 2020, with an average of $150 million per raise, 17 percent more than in 2020. Other deals have also had a bumper start to 2021, with the average deal size reaching more than $500 million, up by more than 66 percent on the 2020 average (Exhibit 3).6 What about SPACs? The analysis above does not include special-purpose acquisition companies (SPACs), which have recently become significant in IPOs in several industries. Some biotech investors we interviewed believe that SPACs represent a route to an IPO. How SPACs will evolve remains to be seen, but biotechs may be part of their story. Fundamentals continue strong When we asked executives and investors why the biotech sector had stayed so resilient during the worst economic crisis in decades, they cited innovation as the main reason. The number of assets transitioning to clinical phases is still rising, and further waves of innovation are on the horizon, driven by the convergence of biological and technological advances. In the present day, many biotechs, along with the wider pharmaceutical industry, are taking steps to address the COVID-19 pandemic. Together, biotechs and pharma companies have [more than 250 vaccine candidates in their pipelines](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/on-pins-and-needles-will-covid-19-vaccines-save-the-world), along with a similar number of therapeutics. What’s more, the crisis has shone a spotlight on pharma as the public seeks to understand the roadblocks involved in delivering a vaccine at speed and the measures needed to maintain safety and efficacy standards. To that extent, the world has been living through a time of mass education in science research and development. Biotech has also benefited from its innate financial resilience. Healthcare as a whole is less dependent on economic cycles than most other industries. Biotech is an innovator, actively identifying and addressing patients’ unmet needs. In addition, biotechs’ top-line revenues have been less affected by lockdowns than is the case in most other industries. Another factor acting in the sector’s favor is that larger pharmaceutical companies still rely on biotechs as a source of innovation. With the [top dozen pharma companies](https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/m-and-a/our-insights/a-new-prescription-for-m-and-a-in-pharma) having more than $170 billion in excess reserves that could be available for spending on M&A, the prospects for further financing and deal making look promising. For these and other reasons, many investors regard biotech as a safe haven. One interviewee felt it had benefited from a halo effect during the pandemic. More innovation on the horizon The investors and executives we interviewed agreed that biotech innovation continues to increase in quality and quantity despite the macroeconomic environment. Evidence can be seen in the accelerating pace of assets transitioning across the development lifecycle. When we tracked the number of assets transitioning to Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III clinical trials, we found that Phase I and Phase II assets have transitioned 50 percent faster since 2018 than between 2013 and 2018, whereas Phase III assets have maintained much the same pace. There could be many reasons for this, but it is worth noting that biotechs with Phase I and Phase II assets as their lead assets have accounted for more than half of biotech IPOs. Having an early IPO gives a biotech earlier access to capital and leaves it with more scope to concentrate on science. Looking forward, the combination of advances in biological science and accelerating developments in technology and artificial intelligence has the potential to take innovation to a new level. A [recent report](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/the-bio-revolution-innovations-transforming-economies-societies-and-our-lives) from the McKinsey Global Institute analyzed the profound economic and social impact of biological innovation and found that biomolecules, biosystems, biomachines, and biocomputing could collectively produce up to 60 percent of the physical inputs to the global economy. The applications of this “Bio Revolution” range from agriculture (such as the production of nonanimal meat) to energy and materials, and from consumer goods (such as multi-omics tailored diets) to a multitude of health applications.

#### Undermines R&D and innovation – aff stress on why their specific medicine is key proves our argument

Mercurio 2/12 (Bryan Mercurio, [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.], 2-12-2021, “WTO Waiver from Intellectual Property Protection for COVID-19 Vaccines and Treatments: A Critical Review“, No Publication, accessed: 8-8-2021, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3789820) ajs

1. An IP waiver would undermine R&D and innovation The IP system is designed to encourage and reward creativity and innovation while benefiting society as a whole. The idea is that IPRs stimulate innovation by “enabling innovators to capture enough of the benefits of their own innovative activity to justify taking considerable risks.” 23 Therefore, while in the short term waiving IPRs may arguably accelerate the distribution of goods and services – i.e. access to COVID-19 vaccines – in the long term undermining IPRs would eliminate the incentives that spark innovation, thus hindering the discovery and development of knowledge for new products or technologies that the world needs.24 An example that illustrates the significance of IP protection is the technology of synthetic mRNA, a genetic technology behind the COVID-19 vaccines of both Pfizer and Moderna. Synthetic mRNA is a genetic technology that has long held huge promise but has so far run into biological roadblocks. The concept of tweaking specific strands in synthetic mRNA to deliver desired results was first introduced in the 1990s, but at that time while it made sense in theory it often failed in the real world as synthetic RNA was notoriously vulnerable to the body’s natural defences and the synthetic RNA was very often destroyed before reaching its target cells. In some situations, the foreign materials even elicited an immune response that poses health risks for some patients. The solution, substituting one of the nucleosides (building blocks of mRNA) for a slightly tweaked version to bypass the body’s defence, was not discovered until 2005 and did not reach commercialization stage for another 15 years. Without the prospect of IP protection, it is simply unimaginable that scientists would devote the human and monetary resources into such R&D as there would have been no incentive to spend the time and effort on a promising but extremely challenging technology. Likewise, venture capitalists would refuse to invest billions of dollars into any research effort knowing that any other company could simply take the successful result and produce a medicine without paying for the R&D costs; in such a scenario, it would be virtually impossible to recoup the initial investment. Thus, without the promise of IP protection the technology underpinning the most advanced and promising COVID-19 vaccines would likely never have been developed. This point is of such importance that it is worth stating the obvious: IPRs have played a large role in the response to COVID-19; a response which has led to an incredible feat of humanity – the identification of the genome of a new pathogen and development of several treatments and promising vaccines within the space of a year. Without the promise of financial gain, the level of R&D into the novel coronavirus would have been greatly reduced and innovation hampered and delayed. In short, the IP system encouraged a robust response to the threat from innovator companies and worked as designed. It would be unwise (if not reckless) to place the innovation system which has delivered results in record time in jeopardy only in exchange for what is at best short-term benefits.

#### Biopharmaceutical innovation is key to prevent future pandemics and bioterror – turns case

Marjanovic and Feijao 20 [(Sonja Marjanovic, Ph.D., Judge Business School, University of Cambridge. Carolina Feijao, Ph.D. in biochemistry, University of Cambridge; M.Sc. in quantitative biology, Imperial College London; B.Sc. in biology, University of Lisbon.) "How to Best Enable Pharma Innovation Beyond the COVID-19 Crisis," RAND Corporation, 05-2020, https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PEA407-1.html] TDI

As key actors in the healthcare innovation landscape, pharmaceutical and life sciences companies have been called on to develop medicines, vaccines and diagnostics for pressing public health challenges. The COVID-19 crisis is one such challenge, but there are many others. For example, MERS, SARS, Ebola, Zika and avian and swine flu are also infectious diseases that represent public health threats. Infectious agents such as anthrax, smallpox and tularemia could present threats in a bioterrorism context.1 The general threat to public health that is posed by antimicrobial resistance is also well-recognised as an area in need of pharmaceutical innovation. Innovating in response to these challenges does not always align well with pharmaceutical industry commercial models, shareholder expectations and competition within the industry. However, the expertise, networks and infrastructure that industry has within its reach, as well as public expectations and the moral imperative, make pharmaceutical companies and the wider life sciences sector an indispensable partner in the search for solutions that save lives. This perspective argues for the need to establish more sustainable and scalable ways of incentivising pharmaceutical innovation in response to infectious disease threats to public health. It considers both past and current examples of efforts to mobilise pharmaceutical innovation in high commercial risk areas, including in the context of current efforts to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. In global pandemic crises like COVID-19, the urgency and scale of the crisis – as well as the spotlight placed on pharmaceutical companies – mean that contributing to the search for effective medicines, vaccines or diagnostics is essential for socially responsible companies in the sector. 2 It is therefore unsurprising that we are seeing industry-wide efforts unfold at unprecedented scale and pace. Whereas there is always scope for more activity, industry is currently contributing in a variety of ways. Examples include pharmaceutical companies donating existing compounds to assess their utility in the fight against COVID19; screening existing compound libraries in-house or with partners to see if they can be repurposed; accelerating trials for potentially effective medicine or vaccine candidates; and in some cases rapidly accelerating in-house research and development to discover new treatments or vaccine agents and develop diagnostics tests.3,4 Pharmaceutical companies are collaborating with each other in some of these efforts and participating in global R&D partnerships (such as the Innovative Medicines Initiative effort to accelerate the development of potential therapies for COVID-19) and supporting national efforts to expand diagnosis and testing capacity and ensure affordable and ready access to potential solutions.3,5,6 The primary purpose of such innovation is to benefit patients and wider population health. Although there are also reputational benefits from involvement that can be realised across the industry, there are likely to be relatively few companies that are ‘commercial’ winners. Those who might gain substantial revenues will be under pressure not to be seen as profiting from the pandemic. In the United Kingdom for example, GSK has stated that it does not expect to profit from its COVID-19 related activities and that any gains will be invested in supporting research and long-term pandemic preparedness, as well as in developing products that would be affordable in the world’s poorest countries.7 Similarly, in the United States AbbVie has waived intellectual property rights for an existing combination product that is being tested for therapeutic potential against COVID-19, which would support affordability and allow for a supply of generics.8,9 Johnson & Johnson has stated that its potential vaccine – which is expected to begin trials – will be available on a not-for-profit basis during the pandemic.10 Pharma is mobilising substantial efforts to rise to the COVID-19 challenge at hand. However, we need to consider how pharmaceutical innovation for responding to emerging infectious diseases can best be enabled beyond the current crisis. Many public health threats (including those associated with other infectious diseases, bioterrorism agents and antimicrobial resistance) are urgently in need of pharmaceutical innovation, even if their impacts are not as visible to society as COVID-19 is in the immediate term. The pharmaceutical industry has responded to previous public health emergencies associated with infectious disease in recent times – for example those associated with Ebola and Zika outbreaks.11 However, it has done so to a lesser scale than for COVID-19 and with contributions from fewer companies. Similarly, levels of activity in response to the threat of antimicrobial resistance are still low.12 There are important policy questions as to whether – and how – industry could engage with such public health threats to an even greater extent under improved innovation conditions.

### 3

#### Presumption and permissibility negate – a) more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted c) ought means the aff has to prove a proactive moral obligation to affirm so absent that you negate

#### Morality must be derived a priori –

#### 1] Is/ought gap – experience only tells us what is, not what ought to be, which raises the question why we ought to follow their framework,

#### 2] Problem of relativism – inability to know each other’s experience makes it an unreliable basis for ethics. People could just say they don’t experience the same.

#### Any moral rule faces the problem of regress – I can keep asking “why should I follow this.” Regress collapses to skep since no one can generate obligations absent grounds for accepting them. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” requires reason to do in the first place which concedes its authority.

#### Practical reason means we must be able to universally will maxims—our judgements are authoritative and can’t only apply to ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me. The only constraint is noncontradiction.

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

**Prefer**

#### [1] Performativity – Freedom is key to the process of justification of arguments which proves you already concede the validity of Kantianism

#### [2] Other frameworks collapse – non-Kantian theories source obligations in extrinsically good objects, but that presupposes the goodness of the rational will as an intrinsic starting point.

#### Now Negate –

#### 1] Reducing protections of IP leads to theft and the free riding of ideas.

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!

#### Free riding and theft are not universalizable – if no one came up with their own ideas there wouldn’t be ideas in the first place to take. If everyone stole there would be no concept of one’s property.

#### 2] IP is a form of property.

Zeidman et al. 16 [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

Many libertarians believe that intellectual property, being intangible, is not real property. A formal libertarian definition of property is difficult to formulate, but we would say that property is that which can be produced or contribute to production. Intellectual property falls clearly within these constraints. Yet some libertarians complain that intellectual is not tangible and is defined by government regulation—the patent laws—such that it would not exist without government definition. Let us look at this argument closer. Land is unquestionably property in the minds of libertarians. Yet the land upon which a house is built was not created by the property owner. It was created by nature or God, depending on your inclination, but no one would claim it to be created by the owner, whereas intellectual property is unquestionably created by the inventor. And how far do property lines extend? Property lines are determined by local governments. One can argue that property lines are negotiated by owners and enforced by governments, but when we moved into our homes, there were no negotiations with surrounding property owners. And how far above ground and below ground do property rights extend? These limitations are definitely not negotiated with other property owners but are determined by laws enforced by governments. Patents also have limitations in terms of scope and time that are determined by government laws. One can see that limitations on patents are similar to those on physical property and in some respects are more closely connected to production. For these reasons, libertarians should recognize patents as they do other forms of property. As a secondary but important example, libertarians are generally concerned about government spying on private conversations. When the government captures a phone conversation, it is not physically taking property. It is simply copying intangible data that exists as a form of transient electrical signals. Copying does not involve removing the original—the phone conversation is not destroyed when it is copied. Yet libertarians recognize that this copying of intangible data is a kind of theft of property. Libertarians should thus be wary of making the argument that intangible patents cannot be property or they may lose their contrary argument that private conversations are personal property to be protected.

#### 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.

## Case

### Fwrk

#### [1] Aggregation of pleasure is bad –

#### [A] You cannot aggregate others happiness because its psychological meaning the framing is not normative

#### [B] Each type of pleasure is different so we can’t weighing between them i.e. joy and happiness which there is no metric to weigh between

#### [C] constitutive properties of action can’t be added – adding circles doesn’t make the circle more circular – we can only look at qualities of the property

#### [2] Consequentialism Fails –

#### [A] Infinite consequences to every action, if a drop my pen it could do an infinite amount of things it can’t be relegated to one specific aspect because consequences will always trigger more consequences

#### [B] Util condemns end states so actions are moral till after they’re taken so every action would be permissible in its intrinsic nature

#### [C] Foreseen consequences are unstable and are contingent on circumstance so they can’t explain why someone acts, it was impossible to know the Industrial Revolution would cause global warming

#### [D] Induction assumes that something in the future happens as it did in the past which requires its past and so on and so on reject regressive fwrks there is no objective bright line to warrant why to carry out an action

### Case

Doesn’t mention cap at all

#### Patents are not the limiting factor – 95% of insulin patents expired in 2016

Kaplan MA 16

Warren A. Kaplan, (MA works in Department of Global Health), 7-19-2016, "The global intellectual property ecosystem for insulin and its public health implications: an observational study," Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice, [https://joppp.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40545-016-0072-8 //](https://joppp.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40545-016-0072-8%20//) AW

Global insulin patents Most patents on insulin products in the world have already expired by 2015 yet many markets continue to be dominated by the brand-name versions marketed by original patent-holders. Figure [1](https://joppp.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40545-016-0072-8#Fig1) plots the percentage of all OB/HC granted patents on insulin remaining in force in any given year (based on a 20 year-from-filing patent life (black markers), and shows how relatively quickly the Eli Lilly, Novo and Pfizer insulin OB/HC patents are expiring compared to Sanofi. We confirm that after 2016, between about 5–20% of Pfizer, Eli Lilly and Novo Nordisk patents listed in the OB/HC remain un-expired and these percentages rapidly dimish, except for those of Sanofi who appears to have listed OB/HC patents whose expirations would extend well into 2030 and beyond (i.e., derived from a patent application filed in 2010).

#### It is not IP that is limiting Insulin’s availability, it is corrupt trial processes

Peccoud 18

Jean Peccoud (professor at colorado state), 9-13-2018, "After a century, insulin is still expensive – could DIYers change that?," Conversation, [https://theconversation.com/after-a-century-insulin-is-still-expensive-could-diyers-change-that-99822 //](https://theconversation.com/after-a-century-insulin-is-still-expensive-could-diyers-change-that-99822%20//) AW

Patents don’t make insulin expensive [Discovering and developing drugs is expensive](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/cost-to-develop-new-pharmaceutical-drug-now-exceeds-2-5b/). Patents help drug companies recoup the costs from their investments by granting them a monopoly for a limited time. Once the patent expires, competing companies can begin producing generics: off-brand versions of a patented drug. This healthy competition drives [prices down](https://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/ResourcesForYou/Consumers/BuyingUsingMedicineSafely/GenericDrugs/UCM609808.pdf). So why, with the original patent long-expired, is there still no affordable generic insulin? Don’t let yourself be misled. The insulin for purchase today is not the same insulin used to treat diabetic patients nearly 100 years ago. That insulin came primarily from animals. Today, insulin is brewed up by microbes that have been [genetically engineered](https://www.fda.gov/downloads/AboutFDA/WhatWeDo/History/ProductRegulation/UCM593496.pdf) with the gene for human insulin. Insulin pumps are one of the newer ways to administer the drug to diabetic patients. [AP Photo/Mark Zaleski](http://www.apimages.com/metadata/Index/Insulin-Legislation/75bd28fc8ed840c3802727306873cce0/1/0) And insulin is seldom injected with an old-fashioned syringe and needle anymore. Now there are insulin pens, pumps, test strips and other devices that improve the quality of life for diabetic patients. Pharmaceutical companies have also modified the chemical formula to produce faster-acting or longer-lasting insulins. With each of these inventions came a new patent. But the benefits of these “improved” insulins [are debatable](https://doi.org/10.2337/dc13-2915), and there’s nothing preventing competing companies from selling older, long off-patent versions of insulin. So [what’s the holdup](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2018.07.009)? Regulations keep insulin expensive Insulin is a [biologic drug](https://theconversation.com/biologics-the-pricey-drugs-transforming-medicine-80258), which means it’s produced by a living organism, not a chemical reaction. This process, called biomanufacturing, is [more inconsistent](https://doi.org/10.1177/1932296813516958) than chemical synthesis of non-biologic drugs like aspirin. Making reliable biologic drugs is a little like winemaking. Even though the winemaker carefully follows a well-established process, minute differences will affect the final product. It’s always wine, but some vintages are better than others and tasting the wine is the only way to evaluate the final product. So if a new company wants to make insulin, that insulin has to be tested on patients in expensive clinical trials.