# NC

## FW

#### Our value is morality as given by the word “ought” in the resolution since it implies a moral obligation.

#### We are all restricted by our experiences; Thought/reason is finite and it is impossible to ever be truly objective.

Mitchell (93’):

Consider the picture Hobbes presents. Human **beings dwell in** a world of **constant movement**. They are impinged on by the motions of the world, which are registered by the senses, and experience these sensory impinge- ments as appearances or representations of something from without; it is **only from** these appearances and **representations** that **thought originates**.'9 Dreams and imaginings - and by this he has in mind what often passes as religion - what are these but agitations which arise from within the body when the organs of sense are "benumbed" and unexcited by outside objects?20 **Only motion begets thought**. Even the "visions" that one may claim of another world transpire from internal disturbances.2' Visions have no referent inde- pendent of the world of motion; if we could only grasp this, then false religion - not all religion -could be dispelled: If this superstitious fear of spirits were taken away, and with it prognostics from dreams, false prophecies, and many other things dependent thereon, by which crafty ambitious persons abuse the simple people, men would be much more fitted than they are for civil society.2 Enveloped in a world of motion**, humanity cannot know** anything about **the infinite**, about God. All **thought is** necessarily **finite.** We rise above the beasts through the use of speech and method;23 yet, in spite of its grandeur, this height still remains within the limits of finititude. What separates humans from beasts is a difference of degree and not of kind. There can be **no legitimate idea of the infinite.** We can, at best, only know our inability to know it. At best, we invoke the name "God" not to make us conceive the infinite but to honor what we cannot know.24 **Reason works** on something finite and **toward something equally finite**. The discourse of the mind and the activity of reason is nothing but a "seeking," a "hunting out," of the causes and effects of sense impressions.25

#### Competition in the state of nature to create meaning causes violence (and makes it impossible to generate moral claims).

Parrish, Rick. “Derrida’s Economy of Violence in Hobbes’ Social Contract” Theory & Event 7:4

"For Hobbes truth is a function of logic and language, not of the relation between language and some extralinguistic reality," so the **"connections** between names and objects **are** not natural."26 They are **artificially constructed** by persons**, based on individual** psychologies and desires. These **individual desires are** for Hobbes **the only measure of good and bad,** because value terms "are ever used with relation to the person that useth them, there being nothing simply and absolutely so, nor any common rule of good and evil to be taken from the nature of the objects themselves."27 Since "there are no authentical doctrines concerning right and wrong, good and evil,"28 these **labels are** placed upon things by humans in **acts of creation** rather than discovered as extrinsic facts.  Elaborating on this, Hobbes writes that "the nature, disposition, and interest of the speaker, such as are the names of virtues and vices; for one man calleth wisdom, what another calleth fear; and one cruelty what another justice."29 A more simplistic understanding of the brutality of the state of nature, which David Gauthier calls the "simple rationality account,"30 has it that mere materialistic competition for goods is the cause of the **war** of all against all, but such rivalry **is a** secondary **manifestation of** the more **fundamental competition** among all persons **to be the dominant creator of meaning.** Certainly, Hobbes writes that persons most frequently "desire to hurt each other" because "many men at the same time have an appetite to the same thing; which yet very often they can neither enjoy in common, nor yet divide it; whence it follows that the strongest must have it, and who is strongest must be decided by the sword."31 But this **competition** for goods only **arises as the result of the** more **primary struggle** that is **inherent** in the nature **of persons of meaning creators.** In the state of nature, "where every man is his own judge,"32 persons will "mete good and evil by diverse measures,"33 creating labels for things as they see fit, based on individual appetites. One of the most significant objects that receives diverse labels in the state of nature is 'threat'.

#### Attempts to make intuitive claims about the kinds of impacts moral theories ought to recognize as inherently bad simply prove that we all have different instincts and intuitions when it comes to morality. If we give in to these instincts, we will never be able to generate a cohesive moral system and will inevitably create violence on those who disagree. The very fact that we are having a framework debate which has been going on for thousands of years proves that there is no one inherently correct moral theory. As such, the only way to escape moral skepticism, under which there can be no moral obligations, is to surrender the authority to make moral claims to a Sovereign.

**Hobbes 2 explains,**

**The only way to** erect such a common power, as may be able to defend them from the invasion of foreigners, and the injuries of one another, and thereby to **secure them** in such sort as that by their own industry **and** by the fruits of the earth they may nourish themselves and **live contentedly, is to confer all** their **power** and strength upon one man, or upon one assembly of men, that may **[and] reduce all their wills**, by plurality of voices, **unto one will**: which is as much as to say, to appoint one man, or assembly of men, to bear their person; and every one to own and acknowledge himself to be author of whatsoever he that so beareth their person shall act, or cause to be acted, in those things which concern the common peace and safety; and therein to submit their wills, every one to his will, and their judgements to his judgement. This is more than consent, or concord; it is a real unity of them all in one and the same person, made by covenant of every man with every man, in such manner as if every man should say to every man: I authorise and give up my right of governing myself to this man, or to this assembly of men, on this condition; that thou give up, thy right to him, and authorise all his actions in like manner. This done, the multitude so united in one person is called a COMMONWEALTH; in Latin, CIVITAS. This is the generation of that great LEVIATHAN, or rather, to speak more reverently, of that mortal god to which we owe, under the immortal God, our peace and defence. **For by this authority**, given him by every particular man in the Commonwealth, he hath the use of so much power and strength conferred on him that, by terror thereof, he **[they are]** is **enabled to form the wills of them all**, to peace at home, and mutual aid against their enemies abroad. And in him consisteth the essence of the Commonwealth; which, to define it, is: one person, of whose acts a great multitude, by mutual covenants one with another, have made themselves every one the author, to the end he may use the strength and means of them all as he shall think expedient for their peace and common defence. And he that carryeth **this person is called sovereign**, and said to have sovereign power; and every one besides, his subject.

#### Thus, the standard is Consistency with the Will of the Sovereign AND reject descriptive arguments on framing because Hobbes is normative.

## 1

#### Member nations of the WTO are considered individual states. Hence the following is true:

#### 1] Moral meaning and therefore moral obligations can only exist for the people within the state, not for the state itself. The state is sovereign and is not bound by any interpretations of morality. This means that even if states wanted to reduce IPRs on medicines, they would not be able to generate a moral obligation on themselves.

#### 2] Even if states could generate moral obligations on the sovereign, they would want to keep their options open and not limit themselves by reducing these rights. Any limit on their power would only decrease their ability to generate moral claims in the first place, creating a paradox where the original obligation ceases to exist. In other words, any acts to limit the sovereign’s power weakens our ability to apply ought claims on them in the first place. The aff limits power since they link into the DA.

#### 3] Even if states could generate moral obligations for the sovereign and the content of those obligations kept the sovereign’s power, there would still be no moral obligations between different states since what binds moral claims and makes them possible is the sovereign. As such, two competing states could not generate moral claims on one another. Rather, they would need to both submit their authority to an even higher sovereign. Although the negative’s advocacy is that such a higher power sovereign ought to exist, the resolution presupposes multiple states and therefore multiple sovereigns (as seen with member NATIONS). The WTO is not considered a sovereign or a higher sovereign as members aren’t forced to follow guidelines and the WTO doesn’t have complete control on every single action of its members.

#### 4] Even if a single state could meet all of these conditions, the obligation would only be true of that single state, and not a general rule that all sovereigns would have to abide by. As such, it is impossible to generate a moral claim for multiple sovereigns. Again, this would all be solved if there were only one sovereign, but that is outside of the affirmative ground.

#### No solvency: The WTO does not authorize the regulation of the IPRs rather the WIPO does (works under the UN), therefore any offense garnered off of the WTO mandating “x” is unreasonable and won’t happen.

https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=446296

**I**ntellectual **p**roperty **r**ights **are protected under the domestic laws of each country**. Industrial property offices, courts, and well-trained practitioners all contribute to the successful operation of the intellectual property system. Although each country determines its own laws and practices, these must conform to the requirements of international agreements to which the countries belong. **Governments** have **formed agreements on intellectual property** since at least 1883, when the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property was adopted.15 Most intellectual property agreements are **administered by the** World Intellectual Property Organization **(WIPO).**

#### Even if they could somehow enforce this through the WTO it won’t be consistent throughout the world because some countries are not a part of the organization and others don’t have a specific definition of IPRs. They also have no brightline on reduce, so they will end up marginally changing the laws on IPRs and the issues intrinsic to the aff will not be solved.

## 2

#### Note – IP, IPR, or patents all refer to Intellectual Property Rights

#### IPR in medicine is critical to the US and global economy, wellbeing, and the pharmaceutical industry. COVID response proves this.

**America’s Biopharmaceutical Companies**https://innovation.org/en/about-us/commitment/innovation-fragility/world-ip-day-intellectual-property-protections-spur-innovation

IP and the New Era of Medicine: Our intellectual property system in the United States promotes competition and is the foundation for breakthrough treatments and cures for patients. Government organizations like the National Institutes of Health (NIH) perform limited research; however, most of the research and development spending comes from biopharmaceutical manufacturers, which are unique in the substantial risk they take on. Because of a competitive U.S. patent system, biopharmaceutical innovators are willing to invest more than any other industry in R&D and bring forward medical advances critical to addressing some of our most challenging diseases. The Importance of IP Protections:  IP protections give innovators certainty that their proprietary inventions or products are protected from copycats, encouraging them to pursue that one idea that may work despite hundreds of others that may fail. At the same time, innovators publish the specifics of their invention in exchange for these protections so others can learn from their research and use it as a building block for future, competing discoveries. Developing new medicines is a lengthy and complex process, and the work that goes into the initial discovery and patent application is just the beginning. A biopharmaceutical manufacturer must then demonstrate the safety and efficacy of a new treatment through rigorous testing that involves clinical trial data before a medicine can be made available to patients. By the time a medicine is ready for the market, it has typically taken on average $2.6 billion and 10 years—about half of the life of a patent. The Value of IP Protections in the United States: In the U.S., IP protections help support more treatment options and generic alternatives, lower long-term health care costs, and Americans living longer, healthier lives. In fact, our IP system strikes a balance between promoting innovation and meeting the needs of patients who rely on breakthrough treatments and cures. In the last three years alone, 150 new treatments and cures have been approved, and over 3,000 generic alternatives have been approved or are on the road to approval. Today, more than 90% of drug prescriptions are filled with generics—up from 19% 35 years ago. Additionally, America’s biopharmaceutical industry is a major contributor to the nation’s R&D economy and helps keep America at the forefront of advanced technology development. The industry ranks first among all U.S. manufacturing industries in terms of R&D dollars invested per employee and is responsible for about one out of every six dollars spent on R&D by U.S. businesses. Today, 90% of new treatments and cures in the world come from the U.S., which is one of only a few countries where medicines are developed. Without reliable patent protections for inventions, patients would have access to fewer treatments and cures The Role of IP Protections Around the World: IP is important on the international scale as well, as intellectual property systems differ from country to country. Many countries around the world are lifting IP standards to benefit their patients and consumers, to empower local inventors and to encourage more investment in innovation. As people everywhere face the deadly COVID-19 pandemic and researchers race to develop and test potential solutions, we need innovation more than ever. Patents and other intellectual property have enabled a rapid response to this disease. They are facilitating the collaboration and partnerships needed to defeat the virus and to quickly scale up manufacturing and distribution of approved treatments and vaccines. To win this fight, countries around the world must continue to protect new inventions.

#### The pharmaceutical industry fuels the US and global economy.

**Burke 20’**

Hannah Burke, Marketing Executive; Member of: [London team](https://www.proclinical.com/team/london-team) and [Business Support team](https://www.proclinical.com/team/business-support)

As Global Growth Partners, we provide a unique proposition; delivering on every stage of the life science process to help individuals, teams and whole organizations reach their goals faster. Through our suite of services, we help you to grow so that you can bring about a positive impact on global health.  Our approach is one of partnership - forming long-term relationships built on integrity and trust. Collaborative from the get-go, our client services team utilize their expertise and understanding to look deeper at your challenges and create tailored solutions. <https://www.proclinical.com/blogs/2020-8/why-are-pharmaceutical-companies-important>

**Pharmaceutical companies are responsible for millions of jobs** across the world. In the US, the biopharmaceutical industry employs over 800,000 professionals who work across a wide range of areas including scientific research, technical support and manufacturing. It is estimated that **in the US, the industry** directly and indirectly **supports** around **4.7 million jobs.** Pharmaceutical companies require highly skilled and educated professionals, with roles for administrative level up to and including Ph.D. scientists. As well as driving medical progress by researching, developing and bringing new medicines that improve health and quality of life for patients around the world, **the** pharmaceutical **industry is** a **key** asset **to the global economy.**[**The industry** reached unprecedented heights in 2019](https://www.proclinical.com/blogs/2020-8/the-top-10-pharmaceutical-companies-in-the-world-2020), **worth** an estimated **$1.3 trillion**. **The** industry’s research and development **(R&D) enterprise** drives sizable economic impacts. **In the US, biopharmaceutical manufacturers spend more in R&D relative to sales than any other** manufacturing **industry, investing** more than **six times the average for all** manufacturing **industries.** Overall, pharmaceutical companies play a pivotal role in helping patients and communities. **They** provide more than potential cures and lifesaving treatments; they also **create** fulfilling **jobs and fuel the global economy**. Looking ahead, the industry will continue to firmly establish its importance in the world by creating more [exciting and ground-breaking treatments](https://www.proclinical.com/blogs/2020-2/pharma-and-medical-devices-opportunities-and-challenges-2020).

#### The aff inherently decimates the pharmaceutical industry through IPR reduction – kills economy in turn AND economic crisis leads to war and conflict. Great depression link to WWII proves.

**Liu 18**

[Managing Director Greater China The Economist Group] [“The next Economic Crisis Could Cause a Global Conflict. Here’s Why.” World Economic Forum, 13 Nov. 2018, www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why.]

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social, political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a major global military conflict. The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates. But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies. Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment. The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929. As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy. If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war. **For example**, during **the Great Depression**, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. **In** the subsequent **five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds.** **Within a decade, World War II had begun**. To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict. According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels. This is all the more worrying in view of the numerous other factors stoking social unrest and diplomatic tension, including technological disruption, a record-breaking migration crisis, anxiety over globalization, political polarization, and rising nationalism. All are symptoms of failed policies that could turn out to be trigger points for a future crisis. Voters have good reason to be frustrated, but the emotionally appealing populists to whom they are increasingly giving their support are offering ill-advised solutions that will only make matters worse. For example, despite the world’s unprecedented interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed, as countries – most notably, Donald Trump’s US – pursue unilateral, isolationist policies. Meanwhile, proxy wars are raging in Syria and Yemen. Against this background, we must take seriously the possibility that the next economic crisis could lead to a large-scale military confrontation. By the logic of the political scientist Samuel Huntington , considering such a scenario could help us avoid it, because it would force us to take action. In this case, the key will be for policymakers to pursue the structural reforms that they have long promised, while replacing finger-pointing and antagonism with a sensible and respectful global dialogue. The alternative may well be global conflagration.

#### Global conflict goes nuclear – extinction impact.

**Germanos 13**

[senior editor staff writer Common Dreams on IPPNW and PSR][“Nuclear War Could Mean ‘Extinction of the Human Race.’” Common Dreams, 10 Dec. 2013, www.commondreams.org/news/2013/12/10/nuclear-war-could-mean-extinction-human-race#:%7E:text=A%20war%20using%20even%20a,people%2C%20a%20new%20report%20warns.&text=The%20updated%20report%20adds%20that,such%20a%20war%20broke%20out.]

A war using even a small percentage of the world's nuclear weapons threatens the lives of two billion people, a new report warns. The findings in the report issued by International Physicians for Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) and Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) are based on studies by climate scientists that show how nuclear war would alter the climate and agriculture, thereby threatening one quarter of the world's population with famine. "A nuclear war using only a fraction of existing arsenals would produce massive casualties on a global scale—far more than we had previously believed," Dr. Ira Helfand, the report’s author and IPPNW co-president, said in a statement. As their previous report showed, years after even a limited nuclear war, production of corn in the U.S. and China's middle season rice production would severely decline, and fears over dwindling food supplies would lead to hoarding and increases in food prices, creating further food insecurity for those already reliant on food imports. The updated report adds that Chinese winter wheat production would plummet if such a war broke out. Based on information from new studies combining reductions in wheat, corn and rice, this new edition doubles the number of people they expect to be threatened by nuclear-war induced famine to over two billion. "The prospect of a decade of widespread hunger and intense social and economic instability in the world’s largest country has immense implications for the entire global community, as does the possibility that the huge declines in Chinese wheat production will be matched by similar declines in other wheat producing countries," Helfand stated. The crops would be impacted, the report explains, citing previous studies, because of the black carbon particles that would be released, causing widespread changes like cooling temperatures, decreased precipitation and decline in solar radiation. In this scenario of famine, epidemics of infectious diseases would be likely, the report states, and could lead to armed conflict. From the report: Within nations where famine is widespread, there would almost certainly be food riots, and competition for limited food resources might well exacerbate ethnic and regional animosities. Among nations, armed conflict would be a very real possibility as states dependent on imports attempted to maintain access to food supplies. While a limited nuclear war would bring dire circumstances, the impacts if the world's biggest nuclear arms holders were involved would be even worse. "With a large war between the United States and Russia, we are talking about the possible —not certain, but possible—extinction of the human race," Helfand told Agence-France Presse. "In this kind of war, biologically there are going to be people surviving somewhere on the planet but the chaos that would result from this will dwarf anything we've ever seen," Helfand told the news agency. As Helfand writes, the data cited in the report "raises a giant red flag about the threat to humanity posed." Yet, as Dr. Peter Wilk, former national executive director of PSR writes in an op-ed today, the "threat is of our own creation." As a joint statement by 124 states delivered to the United Nations General Assembly in October stated: "It is in the interest of the very survival of humanity that nuclear weapons are never used again, under any circumstances." "Countries around the world—those who are nuclear-armed and those who are not—must work together to eliminate the threat and consequences of nuclear war," Helfand said. “In order to eliminate this threat, we must eliminate nuclear weapons.”