# 1AR

#### Interpretation: Debater’s must not read conditional counterplans.

#### They violate

#### 1] Time skew: It takes at least 30 seconds to respond to the counterplan, and barely 2 to kick it, that means the neg can moot an eighth of the 1ar and exacerbate the 1ar time crunch.

#### 2] Clash: Condo is the lazy way out, neg just dumps condo args and collapses to the least covered one which kills substance clash, the constitutive purpose of debate.

#### The voters are

#### 3] Strat skew: Condo allows the neg to run multiple contradictory advocacies which is bad because they get way more ground because they don’t have to be consistent and it’s un-reciprocal because I can’t kick the plan.

CA voters

#### Reject extinction first a] freezes action – every policy has a non-zero risk of causing extinction, b] It’s consequentialist – if we beat util, we beat extinction since it’s a consequence and we don’t look at them c] Ethical prioritization of extinction is horrible and justifies atrocities.

# Libertarianism AC v6

[brackets for clarification]

WTO= World Trade Organization

IP(P/R)=Intellectual Property (Protections/Rights)

### 1AC – Framing

#### The meta ethic is practical reason – ethics begins with the rational capacity to set ends, which necessitates recognizing that capacity in others.

Korsgaard 83 Two Distinctions in Goodness Author(s): Christine M. Korsgaard Source: The Philosophical Review , Apr., 1983, Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 169-195 Published by: Duke University Press on behalf of Philosophical Review Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/2184924>

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, he or she [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 17A much fuller treatment of the ideas of this section is in my paper "Kant's Formula of Humanity," forthcoming in Kant-Studien. 181 This content downloaded from 98.148.2.15 on Sat, 29 Aug 2020 20:12:58 UTC All use subject to h CHRISTINE M. KORSGAARD for there to be any objectively good ends, however, there must be something that is unconditionally good and so can serve as a suffi- cient 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 uncondi- tionally 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 them. For this reason it is our duty to promote the happi- ness of others-the ends that they choose-and, in general, to make the highest good our end.

#### For ethics to be binding it must be universal and constitutive of all individuals.

#### 1] Problem of regress – I can keep asking ‘why value this’ to other frameworks, which falls to moral skep; the only value which solves this is ‘reason,’ as to ask for a reason to value reason, you concede reason’s authority.

#### 2] Universality – for ethics to be objective it must be universal; 1+1=2 can’t be true for me but not for you.

#### 3] Action Theory – Every action can be broken down to infinite movements. Only reason can unify the parts of an action into one, thus all action collapses to reason.

#### 4] Is-ought gap – external conditions can never prescribe action since no set of is statements can ever prove we ought to do something objectively.

#### 5] Culpability – you can only have responsibility over your actions if you freely choose them – if I rob a bank that’s bad but if someone forces me at gunpoint it’s not.

#### Bindingness outweighs a] for the resolution to be true or false it must be binding, otherwise the round is irresolvable, b] it presupposes bindingness since ought implies moral obligations, and c] otherwise people could just ignore ethics and do whatever they want.

#### Thus the standard is consistency with Libertarianism –

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Actor spec – only libertarianism explains how we can leave the state of nature and form the state and it’s obligations.

**Otteson 9** \*\*brackets in original\*\* James R. Otteson (professor of philosophy and economics at Yeshiva University) “Kantian Individualism and Political Libertarianism” The Independent Review, v. 13, n. 3, Winter 2009

In a crucial passage in Metaphysics of Morals, Kant writes that the “Universal Principle of Right” is “‘[e]very action which by itself or by its maxim enables the freedom of each individual’s will to co-exist with the freedom of everyone else in accordance with a universal law is right.’” He concludes, “Thus the universal law of right is as follows: let your external actions be such that the free application of your will can co-exist with the freedom of everyone in accordance with a universal law” (1991, 133, emphasis in original).5 This stipulation becomes for Kant the grounding 5. Other statements of this law of equal freedom appear in the Critique of Pure Reason (Kant [1781] 1965, 312; see also 1991, 191, “Universal History,” 45 and 50, and “Theory and Practice,” 73 and 80). 394 ✦ JAMES R. OTTESON THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW justification for the existence of a state, its raison d’être, and the reason we leave the state of nature is to secure this sphere of maximum freedom compatible with the same freedom of all others. Because this freedom must be complete, in the sense of being as full as possible given the existence of other persons who demand similar freedom, it entails that the state may—indeed, must—secure this condition of freedom, but undertake to do nothing else because any other state activities would compromise the very autonomy the state seeks to defend. Kant’s position thus outlines and implies a political philosophy that is broadly libertarian; that is, it endorses a state constructed with the sole aim of protecting its citizens against invasions of their liberty. For Kant, individuals create a state to protect their moral agency, and in doing so they consent to coercion only insofar as it is required to prevent themselves or others from impinging on their own or others’ agency. In his argument, individuals cannot rationally consent to a state that instructs them in morals, coerces virtuous behavior, commands them to trade or not, directs their pursuit of happiness, or forcibly requires them to provide for their own or others’ pursuits of happiness. And except in cases of punishment for wrongdoing,6 this severe limitation on the scope of the state’s authority must always be respected: “The rights of man must be held sacred, however great a sacrifice the ruling power may have to make. There can be no half measures here; it is no use devising hybrid solutions such as a pragmatically conditioned right halfway between right and utility. For all politics must bend the knee before right, although politics may hope in return to arrive, however slowly, at a stage of lasting brilliance” (Perpetual Peace, 1991, 125). The implication is that a Kantian state protects against invasions of freedom and does nothing else; in the absence of invasions or threats of invasions, it is inactive.

#### 2] Universality – any universal ethic necessitates freedom as unconditionally good.

Sorens 17 Jason Sorens, 2-10-2017, "Immanuel Kant and the Philosophy of Freedom," No Publication, <https://fee.org/articles/immanuel-kant-and-the-philosophy-of-freedom/>

The Categorical Imperative The moral law takes the form of an unconditional or categorical imperative. It says, for instance, “Do not murder, even if you can achieve your goals by doing so.” It’s not a hypothetical imperative like “if you don’t want to burn your hand, don’t touch the hot stove,” or “if you don’t want to go to jail, don’t murder.” It commands our wills regardless of what our particular goals are. Kant thinks all particular moral commands can be summed up in a fundamental, categorical imperative. It takes three forms. I’ll mention two of them here. The equal freedom of each individual is perfectly consistent with the utmost inequality in the degree of possessions. One form of the categorical imperative focuses on the notion that human beings are special because of our capacity for moral responsibility. Kant assumes that this capacity gives each individual human being a dignity, not a price. What that means is that we must not trade off the legitimate rights and interests of any human being for anything else. We must not treat other people or ourselves as means only to some other end, but always as ends in ourselves. The other, perhaps more frequently cited form of the imperative is highly abstract: “Always act according to that maxim that you can will as a universal law of nature.” In other words, think about the principle or rule that justifies your action; then figure out whether it’s universalizable. If so, it is an acceptable principle or rule for you to follow; if not, it is not. “Steal when I can gain an advantage thereby” [stealing] is not universalizable because it implies that others may steal from me, that is, take what I own against my will. But I cannot will against my own will. Rights and Freedoms Now, this understanding of the dignity of the individual human being implies that persons have rights, in other words, that we have an enforceable duty to respect the freedoms of all persons. So we can’t trample on the freedoms of one person to help one or many others (contra the “act utilitarians”). For instance, it would be wrong to kill one healthy person to distribute [t]he[i]r organs to several sick people, even if doing so was necessary to [would] save two or more lives. Each person has a dignity that must not be trampled, no matter what. (Another misunderstanding of Kant says that he thinks your intentions are the only thing that matter and you can ignore the consequences of your actions. To the contrary, to ignore consequences is to act with ill intent. Consequentialists differ from Kant in believing that only aggregate consequences of actions need be taken into account. Kant’s political theory is individualistic, while consequentialist theories are inevitably collectivist.) In an essay titled “Theory and Practice” (short for a much longer title), Kant gives an overview of his political theory. Once a civil state has been established to secure our rights, he says, No one can compel me to be happy in accordance with his conception of the welfare of others, for each may seek his happiness in whatever way he sees fit, so long as he does not infringe upon the freedom of others to pursue a similar end which can be reconciled with the freedom of everyone else within a general workable law — i.e. he must accord to others the same right as he enjoys himself. Kant, therefore, endorses the law of equal freedom, that everyone should have maximum freedom to pursue happiness consistent with the like freedom of everyone else, or what some libertarians have called the “Non-Aggression Principle.” This principle applies under government, not just in the state of nature. The only justification for coercion in his philosophy seems to be [is] the defense of self or others. The equal freedom of each subject in a civil state, Kant says, “is, however, perfectly consistent with the utmost inequality of the mass in the degree of its possessions, whether these take the form of physical or mental superiority over others, or of fortuitous external property and of particular rights (of which there may be many) with respect to others.” Kant is no Rawlsian; he is a classical liberal who realizes that liberty upsets patterns and should be preserved in spite of (or because of) that. In the same essay, Kant endorses Locke’s view of the social contract. A legitimate state with a right to rule can emerge only after unanimous consent to the initial contract. To do otherwise would be to violate the non-consenters’ rights. We now know that unanimous consent to the social contract has rarely occurred in human history, and so Kant’s strong theory of individual rights sets us up for a rejection of political authority. If we reject political authority, the largest state we can possibly justify is a minimal state, and, according to some, not even that. Kantian Liberalism Kant’s moral philosophy justifies extremely strong individual rights against coercion. The only justification for coercion in his philosophy seems to be the defense of self or others. His ideal government, therefore, seems to be extremely limited and to allow for the free play of citizens’ imaginations, enterprise, and experiments in living.

#### 3] The structure of action necessitates that freedom is the first and primary good.

Gewirth 84 [Alan Gewirth, () "The Ontological Basis of Natural Law: A Critique and an Alternative" American Journal of Jurisprudence: Vol. 29: Iss. 1 Article 5, 1984, https://scholarship.law.nd.edu/ajj/vol29/iss1/5/]

Let me briefly sketch the main line of argument that leads to this conclusion. As I have said, the argument is based on the generic features of human action. To begin with, every agent acts for purposes [t]he[y] regards as good. Hence, [t]he[y] must regard as necessary goods the freedom and well being that [is] are the generic features and necessary conditions of his action and successful action in general. From this, it follows that every agent logically must hold or accept that he has rights to these conditions. For if he were to deny that he has these rights, then he would have to admit that it is permissible for other persons to remove from him the very conditions of freedom and well-being that, as an agent, he must have. But it is contradictory for him to hold both that he must have these conditions and also that he may not have them. Hence, on pain of self-contradiction, every agent must accept that he has rights to freedom and well-being. Moreover, every agent must further admit that all other agents also have those rights, since all other actual or prospective agents have the same general characteristics of agency on which he must ground his own right-claims. What I am saying, then, is that every agent, simply by virtue of being an agent, must regard his freedom and well being as necessary goods and must hold that he and all other actual or prospective agents have rights to these necessary goods. Hence, every agent, on pain of self-contradiction, must accept the following principle: Act in accord with the generic rights of your recipients as well as of yourself. The generic rights are rights to the generic features of action, freedom, and well-being. I call this the Principle of Generic Consistency (PGC), because it combines the formal consideration of consistency with the material consideration of the generic features and rights of action.

#### 4] Reject consequences – a] we can only observe the consequence of an action after it has occurred which means they can’t prescribe actions, b] the problem of induction precludes looking at consequences and undermines causality.

Vickers 14 [John Vickers, 2014, The Problem of Induction, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/induction-problem/]

The original problem of induction can be simply put. It concerns the support or justification of inductive methods; methods that predict or infer, in Hume's words, that “instances of which we have had no experience resemble those of which we have had experience” (THN, 89). Such methods are clearly essential in scientific reasoning as well as in the conduct of our everyday affairs. The problem is how to support or justify them and it leads to a dilemma: the principle cannot be proved deductively, for it is contingent, and only necessary truths can be proved deductively. Nor can it be supported inductively—by arguing that it has always or usually been reliable in the past—for that would beg the question by assuming just what is to be proved.

#### c] aggregation fails – pleasure and pain are incommunicable, since each person has their own scale of pain and we can’t experience each other’s feelings, d] resolvability – margin of errors make weighing impossible, only libertarianism solve by having a brightline for ethical violations, e] butterfly effect – actions have infinite cascading consequences which effect vast numbers of people,

### 1AC – Offense

#### Now affirm –

#### 1] IP is not legitimate property and it directly conflicts with freedom – multiple warrants.

Long 95 [Roderick T. Long, American professor of philosophy at Auburn University with a PhD in philosophy from Cornell, 1995, “The Libertarian Case Against Intellectual Property Rights,” Free Nation, [http://freenation.org/a/f31l1.html]/](http://freenation.org/a/f31l1.html%5d/) lm

The Ethical Argument Ethically, property rights of any kind have to be justified as extensions of the right of individuals to control their own lives. Thus any alleged property rights that conflict with [freedom] this moral basis — like the "right" to own slaves — are invalidated. In my judgment, intellectual property rights also fail to pass this test [as]. To enforce copyright laws and the like is to prevent people from making peaceful use of the information they possess. If you have acquired the information legitimately (say, by buying a book), then on what grounds can you be prevented from using it, reproducing it, trading it? Is this not a violation of the freedom of speech and press? It may be objected that the person who originated the information deserves ownership rights over it. But information is not a concrete thing an individual can control; it is a universal, existing in other people's minds and other people's property, and over these the originator has no legitimate sovereignty. You cannot own information without owning other people. Suppose I write a poem, and you read it and memorize it. By memorizing it, you have in effect created a "software" duplicate of the poem to be stored in your brain. But clearly I can claim no rights over that copy so long as you remain a free and autonomous individual. That copy in your head is yours and no one else's. But now suppose you proceed to transcribe my poem, to make a "hard copy" of the information stored in your brain. The materials you use — pen and ink — are your own property. The information template which you used — that is, the stored memory of the poem — is also your own property. So how can the hard copy you produce from these materials be anything but yours to publish, sell, adapt, or otherwise treat as you please? An item of intellectual property is a universal. Unless we are to believe in Platonic Forms, universals as such do not exist, except insofar as they are realized in their many particular instances. Accordingly, I do not see how anyone can claim to own, say, the text of Atlas Shrugged unless that amounts to a claim to own every single physical copy of Atlas Shrugged. But the copy of Atlas Shrugged on my bookshelf does not belong to Ayn Rand or to her estate. It belongs to me. I bought it. I paid for it. (Rand presumably got royalties from the sale, and I'm sure it wasn't sold without her permission!) The moral case against patents is even clearer. A patent is, in effect, a claim of ownership over a law of nature. What if Newton had claimed to own calculus, or the law of gravity? Would we have to pay a fee to his estate every time we used one of the principles he discovered? "... the patent monopoly ... consists in protecting inventors ... against competition for a period long enough to extort from the people a reward enormously in excess of the labor measure of their services, — in other words, in giving certain people a right of property for a term of years in laws and facts of Nature, and the power to exact tribute from others for the use of this natural wealth, which should be open to all." (Benjamin Tucker, Instead of a Book, By a Man Too Busy to Write One: A Fragmentary Exposition of Philosophical Anarchism (New York: Tucker, 1893), p. 13.) Defenders of patents claim that patent laws protect ownership only of inventions, not of discoveries. (Likewise, defenders of copyright claim that copyright laws protect only implementations of ideas, not the ideas themselves.) But this distinction is an artificial one. Laws of nature come in varying degrees of generality and specificity; if it is a law of nature that copper conducts electricity, it is no less a law of nature that this much copper, arranged in this configuration, with these other materials arranged so, makes a workable battery. And so on. Suppose you are trapped at the bottom of a ravine. Sabre-tooth tigers are approaching hungrily. Your only hope is to quickly construct a levitation device I've recently invented. You know how it works, because you attended a public lecture I gave on the topic. And it's easy to construct, quite rapidly, out of materials you see lying around in the ravine. But there's a problem. I've patented my levitation device. I own it — not just the individual model I built, but the universal. Thus, you can't construct your means of escape without using my property. And I, mean old skinflint that I am, refuse to give my permission. And so the tigers dine well. This highlights the moral problem with the notion of intellectual property. By claiming a patent on my levitation device, I'm saying that you are not permitted [can’t] to use your own knowledge to further your ends. By what right? Another problem with patents is that, when it comes to laws of nature, even fairly specific ones, the odds are quite good that two people, working independently but drawing on the same background of research, may come up with the same invention (discovery) independently. Yet patent law will arbitrarily grant exclusive rights to the inventor who reaches the patent office first; the second inventor, despite having developed the idea on his own, will be forbidden to market his invention. Ayn Rand attempts to rebut this objection: "As an objection to the patent laws, some people cite the fact that two inventors may work independently for years on the same invention, but one will beat the other to the patent office by an hour or a day and will acquire an exclusive monopoly, while the loser's work will then be totally wasted. This type of objection is based on the error of equating the potential with the actual. The fact that a man might have been first, does not alter the fact that he wasn't. Since the issue is one of commercial rights, the loser in a case of that kind has to accept the fact that in seeking to trade with others he must face the possibility of a competitor winning the race, which is true of all types of competition." (Ayn Rand, Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal (New York: New American Library, 1967), p. 133.) But this reply will not do. Rand is suggesting that the competition to get to the patent office first is like any other kind of commercial competition. For example, suppose you and I are competing for the same job, and you happen to get hired simply because you got to the employer before I did. In that case, the fact that I might have gotten there first does not give me any rightful claim to the job. But that is because I have no right to the job in the first place. And once you get the job, your rightful claim to that job depends solely on the fact that your employer chose to hire you. In the case of patents, however, the story is supposed to be different. The basis of an inventor's claim to a patent on X is supposedly the fact that he has invented X. (Otherwise, why not offer patent rights over X to anyone who stumbles into the patent office, regardless of whether they've ever even heard of X?) Registering one's invention with the patent office is supposed to record one's right, not to create it. Hence it follows that the person who arrives at the patent office second has just as much right as the one who arrives first — and this is surely a reductio ad absurdum of the whole notion of patents. The Economic Argument

#### 2] IP for medicines are inconsistent with libertarian property rights and hinder the free market – turns innovation.

Richman 12 [Sheldon Richman, Sheldon Richman is a Research Fellow at The Independent Institute, The American Conservative, “Patent Nonsense,” January 18th, 2012, [https://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/patent-nonsense/]/](https://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/patent-nonsense/%5d/) lm

But contrary to Rand and Spooner, there is a distinction between physical objects and ideas that is crucial to the property question. Two or more people cannot use the same pair of socks at the same time and in the same respect, but they can use the same idea—or if not the same idea, ideas with the same content. That tangible objects are scarce and finite accounts for the emergence of property rights in civilization. Considering the nature of human beings and the physical world they inhabit, if individuals are to flourish in society they need rules regarding thine and mine. But “ideal objects” are not bound by the same restrictions. Ideas can be multiplied infinitely and almost costlessly; they can be used nonrivalrously.

If I articulate an idea in front of other people, each now has his own “copy.” Yet I retain mine. However the others use their copies, it is hard to see how they have committed an injustice.

Contrary to Rand, ideas, while inherent in purposeful human action, have no role in establishing ownership. If I own the inputs of productive effort, that suffices to establish that I own the output. If I build a model airplane out of wood and glue, I own it not because of any idea in my head, but because I owned the wood, the glue, and myself. On the other hand, if Howard Roark’s evil twin trespasses on your land and, using your materials, builds the most original house ever imagined, he would not be the rightful owner. You would be, and—bad law notwithstanding—you would have the objective moral right to use the design.

In practical terms, when one acquires a copyright or a patent, what one really acquires is the power to ask the government stop other[s] people from doing harmless things with their own property. IP is thus inconsistent with the right to property.

Underlying the IP defense is the faulty assumption that imitation produces little value when in fact it is critical to competitive markets and progress, most of which comes through incremental improvements to existing ideas rather than big dramatic breakthroughs. Copying combined with product differentiation equals rising living standards. Had imitation been forbidden earlier in human history, stagnation would have been mankind’s lot. Attempts in that direction today concentrate economic power and increase the cost of living for the rest of us.

the only thing standing between the old information and media dinosaurs and their total collapse is their so-called intellectual property rights—at least to the extent they’re still enforceable. Ownership of intellectual property becomes the new basis for the power of institutional hierarchies and the primary buttress for corporate boundaries… . Without intellectual property, in any industry where the basic production equipment is widely affordable, and bottom-up networking renders management obsolete, it is likely that self-managed, cooperative production will replace the old managerial hierarchies.

This objection exposes what is at stake in IP: [is] monopoly power granted by the state. In fact, patents originated as royal grants of privilege, while copyright originated in the power to censor. This in itself doesn’t prove these practices clash with liberty, but their pedigrees are indeed tainted.

Property rights arose to grapple with natural scarcity; “intellectual property” rights were invented to create scarcity where it does not naturally exist.

Don’t patents encourage innovation and therefore bestow incalculable benefits on all us? This crosses the boundary from justice to utilitarian considerations. The concern here is not with rewards to the innovator but with the good of society. What does the IP opponent say?

### 1AC – Plan

#### Thus the plan: The Member Nations of the WTO ought to reduce IPP for medicines by replacing the current system with a Weak-Type Protection system that’s consistent with Libertarianism. Definitions in doc.

Hopper 13 [Hopper, Zachary, Zachary Hopper is a professor in the Philosophy department at Georgia State University, "Thomas Pogge And The Two Types Of Libertarian." Thesis, Georgia State University, 2013. [https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/philosophy\_theses/133]/](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/philosophy_theses/133%5d/) lm

The tension between strong physical property rights and intellectual property rights is a legitimate concern for libertarians, and perhaps it is this tension that has caused many libertarians to abandon the pro-IP ship. However, this tension is not, in and of itself, enough to show that libertarianism is necessarily inconsistent with intellectual property rights. Contrary to what Pogge argues, the tension between a strong natural right to tangible property and intellectual property protection only shows one thing: that intellectual property rights, in any form that allows innovators control over all physical tokens of their innovation type, are inconsistent with libertarianism. And this view, as noted above, is only a problem for the status quo libertarian. The revisionist libertarian, on the other hand, proposes an alternative system of IPP that is consistent with the libertarian values of freedom and rights to tangible property. Jonathan Trerise argues in favor of a system of IPP called Weak-Type Protection (WTP). He explains WTP as “the view that one has ownership over one’s original token(s), as well as a claim right on the rivalrous uses of copies of one’s original token(s)” (IPTJ 124). Trerise maintains that a WTP system of intellectual property protection is preferable to Strong-Type Protection systems, like the current pharmaceutical patent regime, which he believes are unjustified because of their infringements on individual liberty. A rivalrous use of an object occurs when someone uses the object such that the availability or value of the object to another person is reduced. For instance, my use of an acre of land is rivalrous because it prevents others from using that land. However, my use of the wind to fly a kite is non-rivalrous, since others may use the same resource for their own purposes. The advantage of WTP is twofold: WTP allows one to own ideas in that others are not free to copy and profit from those copies, thereby impacting your ability to make a profit. WTP also does not, in contrast to STP, restrict one’s ability to make independent and yet qualitatively identical items; that is, WTP regards the causal history of putative copies as relevant to determining their status as ownables. (IPTJ 124)

In the case of pharmaceuticals, a WTP system of intellectual property protection allows pharmaceutical innovators to profit from their innovations, as they retain weak-type rights over their innovations. However, a WTP system does not absolutely prohibit others from making and using copies of the innovation. Innovators who independently arrive at the same innovation have no claim against one another under a WTP system. A WTP system of intellectual property is, I maintain, an example of a system of IPP that can be endorsed by the revisionist libertarian. Under a WTP system, if I were to invent a vaccine for Chagas disease, I would have intellectual property rights to this vaccine type, as well as physical property rights to each vaccine token I produced. However, I would be unable to prevent others from producing, owning, and using their own vaccine tokens for Chagas disease, even if they directly copied my vaccine. The only restriction I could place on others would be to prohibit rivalrous uses of their tokens of my Chagas disease vaccine. Primarily, this restriction would prohibit others from directly copying (e.g. through reverse engineering) and selling my vaccine, since that would reduce the value of my vaccine. But it would not prohibit an individual from selling the Chagas disease vaccine she created independent of my vaccine, even if the two were identical.14

Furthermore, on a WTP system I would have no claim against someone who, inspired by my Chagas disease vaccine, created and sold her own vaccine type, even if it bore a striking similarity to my vaccine. Instances of “creative inspiration,” as Trerise notes, would be the most difficult kind of case for WTP to handle. It does not seem that this difficulty would prove insurmountable, though, since the current international IPP regime is far more complicated than a WTP system, and it manages to deal with similar difficulties. Although I would not have a right to market-exclusivity under a WTP system, I would still have intellectual property rights to my vaccine type, since I mixed my labor with materials I fairly appropriated.16 Of course, a WTP system like Trerise’s would need to be fleshed out in considerable detail before being implemented in the real world, but this brief sketch is enough to show how such a system would operate, and to prove that libertarianism can generate intellectual property rights and endorse strong natural rights to physical property.

The freedom this system allows would have a significant impact on the world’s poor. Under a WTP system, non-governmental organizations would be permitted to produce and distribute essential medicines to the poor, so long as they did not impact the ability of pharmaceutical corporations to make a profit. To avoid taking profits from patentees, NGOs might, for example, require recipients of medicines under patent to prove that they are unable to pay the market price for medicines. With increased access to essential medicines, the global poor would enjoy greater human rights protection under a WTP system than under the status quo. So by Pogge’s own normative principles, a WTP system of intellectual property is a plausible alternative to the Health Impact Fund.

#### ‘reduce’

Merriam Webster 21 “Reduce.” Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reduce. Accessed 8 Aug. 2021.

Definition of reduce

[transitive verb](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/transitive)

1a: to draw together or cause to converge : [CONSOLIDATE](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/consolidate) reduce all the questions to one

b(1): to diminish in size, amount, extent, or number reduce taxes reduce the likelihood of war

#### ‘intellectual property’

WIPO [World Intellectual Property Organization, IP, “What is Intellectual Property?” https://www.wipo.int/about-ip/en/]/lm

What is Intellectual Property?

Intellectual property (IP) refers to creations of the mind, such as inventions; literary and artistic works; designs; and symbols, names and images used in commerce.

IP is protected in law by, for example, [patents](https://www.wipo.int/patents/en/), [copyright](https://www.wipo.int/copyright/en/) and [trademarks](https://www.wipo.int/trademarks/en/), which enable people to earn recognition or financial benefit from what they invent or create. By striking the right balance between the interests of innovators and the wider public interest, the IP system aims to foster an environment in which creativity and innovation can flourish.

#### ‘medicines’

Merriam Webster 21 [“Medicine.” Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, [https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/medicine. Accessed 11 Aug. 2021.]/](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/medicine.%20Accessed%2011%20Aug.%202021.%5d/) lm

medicine [noun](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/noun) med·​i·​cine | \ ˈme-di-sən , British usually ˈmed-sən \ Definition of medicine 1a: a substance or preparation used in treating disease cough medicine b: something that affects well-being he's bad medicine— Zane Grey

#### ‘members nations of WTO’

WTO 16 [World Trade Organization, Understanding the WTO: The Organization, “Members and Observers,” July 29th, 2016, [https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\_e/whatis\_e/tif\_e/org6\_e.htm]/](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/org6_e.htm%5d/) lm

Members and Observers

164  members since 29 July 2016 , with dates of WTO membership.

Click any member to see key information on trade statistics, WTO commitments, disputes, trade policy reviews, and notifications.

#### ‘WTO’

WTO [World Trade Organization, About WTO, “What is the WTO?” [https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\_e/whatis\_e/whatis\_e.htm]/](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/whatis_e.htm%5d/) lm

The World Trade Organization (WTO) is the only global international organization dealing with the rules of trade between nations. At its heart are the WTO agreements, negotiated and signed by the bulk of the world’s trading nations and ratified in their parliaments. The goal is to help producers of goods and services, exporters, and importers conduct their business.

[Who we are](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/who_we_are_e.htm)

There are a number of ways of looking at the World Trade Organization. It is an organization for trade opening. It is a forum for governments to negotiate trade agreements. It is a place for them to settle trade disputes. It operates a system of trade rules. Essentially, the WTO is a place where member governments try to sort out the trade problems they face with each other.

[What we do](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/what_we_do_e.htm)

The WTO is run by its member governments. All major decisions are made by the membership as a whole, either by ministers (who usually meet at least once every two years) or by their ambassadors or delegates (who meet regularly in Geneva).

[What we stand for](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/what_stand_for_e.htm)

The WTO agreements are lengthy and complex because they are legal texts covering a wide range of activities. But a number of simple, fundamental principles run throughout all of these documents. These principles are the foundation of the multilateral trading system.

[Overview](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/wto_dg_stat_e.htm)

The World Trade Organization — the WTO — is the international organization whose primary purpose is to open trade for the benefit of all.

### 1AC – Advantage Biodiveristy

#### IP for medicines have caused massive exploitation of nature that has pushed biodiversity loss to the brink.

**Pamun 14** [“PAMUN Xviii Research Report— Question Of Intellectual Property And Biodiversity” [http://asp-edu.net/pamun/pamun2013/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/OK\_EDITED\_-UNCTAD-biodiversity-and-IP-1.pdf]

During the last few years, biodiversity has been lost at an unprecedented rate throughout the world in every ecosystem. According to the FAO, about 75% of the genetic diversity found in agricultural crops has been lost over the last century, and this phenomenon continues. It is imperative that we conserve agricultural biodiversity: higher biodiversity of agricultural crops helps increase yield stability and soil fertility and gives species the ability to adapt to changing conditions. High agricultural biodiversity also helps protect our health by ensuring sustainable production in medicinal plant use systems. Agricultural biodiversity loss and the present IPR legislation are inextricably tied. IPRs continue to homogenise agricultural production and medicinal plant use systems and could reduce crop variety development. Our health and our environment is negatively affected, and it is of utmost importance to conserve our agricultural biodiversity. Evolution of IPRs on biological resources As stated before, IPRs are rights to new ideas and information, which allow the creator to prevent the imitation or the commercial exploitation of his/her creations. IPRs have existed for centuries; however, the use of IPRs on living organisms such as GRs is a recent phenomenon. In 1930, the U.S. government passed the U.S. Plant Patent Act, which granted IPRs to new plant varieties with the exception of sexual and tuber-propagated plants. Other countries also extended such forms of IPRs, and in 1957, the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) was formed, which was established by the International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants that was signed in 1961. The convention was revised in 1972, 1978, and 1991 in Geneva, and each member state is expected to adopt laws that meet the requirements of the convention. With the latest revision in 1991, the convention recognizes new plant varieties as intellectual property and extended international PBRs. Furthermore, in 1972, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the patent claim made by the microbiologist Ananda Chakrabarty for a genetically engineered bacterial strain was permissible, which made it clear that anything man-made, including human genetic material, could be patentable. The legally binding TRIPS agreement in 1995 (explained in detail below) further imposed private IPRs on plant varieties, increasing the control of governments and large corporations over biogenetic resources. International Treaties and Agreements The link between IPRs and biodiversity has been shaped by numerous agreements and institutions. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) are the two principal agreements on this issue. Moreover, organizations such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) have also become more active in dealing with this issue, and various megadiverse countries (see Major Countries Involved for definition) such as India, Costa Rica, and Mexico are passing laws in order to deal with this issue. The most important agreement on the conservation of biodiversity is the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which is often regarded as the founding document of global commitment to sustainable growth. The CBD is a legally binding, multilateral treaty signed on June 5th, 1992. It has been signed by 168 nations, 157 of which have ratified the convention. The convention has three main goals: the “conservation of biological diversity”; the “sustainable use of the components of biological diversity”; and the “fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources”. The treaty recognizes the sovereign right of states over GRs, and it also demands the respect and preservation of associated traditional knowledge at the national level. In fact, article 8(j) of the CBD states: ““Each contracting party shall [...] respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of the holders of such knowledge, innovations and practices and encourage the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge innovations and practices”, thus recognizing the collective rights of indigenous and local communities, and encouraging member nations to follow the ABS provisions of the agreement, which aim to share GRs equitably with the indigenous communities. Moreover, to improve the implementation of the CBD, two supplementary agreements to the CBD have been signed: the Cartagena Protocol of 2002 and the Nagoya Protocol of 2010. The Nagoya Protocol (Appendix IV), which is explained in the Previous Attempts to Solve the Issue section, deals with the implementation of the third objective: fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources. Another important legally binding agreement is the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) in 1995. All 162 members of the WTO are signatory states of the agreement. Before the TRIPS agreement was signed, IPRs were restricted within countries; however, with the national treatment article in the TRIPS agreement, every signatory state should ensure that the rights given by IPRs are applied to locals and foreigners alike. In relation to plant varieties, it is important to note that the TRIPS agreement requires that plant varieties, along with microorganisms and microbiological processes, be eligible for IPR protection. In article 27.3(b) of the TRIPS agreement, signatory member states are not permitted to exclude microorganisms and microbiological processes from patentability, and they are expected to provide protection of these new plant varieties through patents, or an “effective” sui generis system. In other words, the agreement requires an exclusive protection for plant varieties, be it in the form of patents or a new sui generis system, which the WTO decides is effective or not. Another form of protection that many developing countries are also adopting as a sui generis system is the model of plant variety protection that is provided by the UPOV Convention (PBRs), whose standards are pretty much equivalent to patent protection. Hence, the TRIPS agreement not only imposes exclusive, private IPRs on biological resources, but it also does not attempt to protect indigenous and local community knowledge. Unlike the CBD, which aims to protect TK and maintain biodiversity, the TRIPS agreement legitimizes the commercial use of biodiversity-related knowledge. However, the TRIPS agreement does require the review of Article 27.3(b)–the article that prohibits the exclusion of microorganisms from patentability and provides protection for plant varieties–which has facilitated discussion on the issues with the article (see ‘Previous Attempts’ for detailed information). It is also important to note that both agreements are highly flexible, even though they contradict each other in many aspects. Many articles of the TRIPS agreement can be used by indigenous communities to protect their interests. Article 8 allows members to protect public interest through legal measures and environmental protection could be justified as as being in "public interest". Moreover, article 27(2) allows members to exclude inventions from patentability to safeguard against "serious prejudice" to the environment. The CBD, on the other hand, ensures that it does not conflict with the implementation of any other international agreement. Article 22 of CBD states: “The provisions of this Convention shall not affect the rights and obligations of any Contracting Party deriving from any existing international agreement, except where the exercise of those rights and obligations would cause a serious damage or threat to biological diversity”. This article provides countries with a leeway; although both agreements are legally binding, countries can implement the TRIPS agreement without adhering to obligations of the CBD. Impacts of present IPR legislation Exploitation of traditional knowledge Existing IPR systems, particularly patents, increase the risk of exploitation of traditional knowledge. Existing IPRs are expensive and challenging to acquire, failing to provide local and indigenous communities incentives to protect or capitalize on their traditional knowledge even though traditional knowledge is often shared by all members of the community and passed through the generations. Commercial Exploitation of Plant Varieties and GRs The TRIPS agreement is intended to provide private IPRs on any products, be they biogenetic resources or not, in order to ensure that trade goes smoothly and corporate interests are protected internationally. In the process, the agreement provides exclusive control of plant varieties to corporations and individuals that they have patented. The privatization of IPRs as a result of the TRIPS agreement has caused commercial and industrial interests to control the resources of developing countries that are rich in biodiversity, leading to biological uniformity and in turn biodiversity loss (explained below). Besides, these private commercial interests are encroaching upon common indigenous and local community knowledge, which is another negative impact of the TRIPS agreement. Biological Uniformity The present IPR legislation causes biological uniformity because of growing private commercial interests, which directly causes biodiversity loss. Countries that extend IPRs to plant varieties will be establishing an IPR system where few corporations and individuals prohibit others from making or using the protected variety or any product containing protected genetic information, and push its production for profits. Farmers will be faced with production restrictions, while scientists will be faced with research restrictions. All in all, the present IPR legislation not only discourages the growth of new and different plant varieties, but it also restricts researchers from freely using the genetic information for research into diseases or for making new and more effective plant varieties. Hence, this reduces the availability of biodiversity and leads to the homogenization of agricultural production and plant use systems. For example, Monsanto, an agrochemical and agricultural biotechnology corporation that is facing a surge of lawsuits, is also accused of biological uniformity. It owns such a large portion of the world's cotton seed supply that cotton farmers are not given access to non-GM cotton seeds. These farmers are also not allowed to save, reuse, or even study the seeds due to biotech IPR laws, greatly hindering natural diversity.

#### Pharmaceuticals take advantage of strong IP to exploit natural resources and indigenous communities – only the plan solves.

Mackey and Liang 12 [Tim K. Mackey, Bryan A. Liang, MD, PhD, JD, NCBI, PMC, US National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health, “Integrating Biodiversity Management and Indigenous Biopiracy Protection to Promote Environmental Justice and Global Health,” June, 2012, [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/]/](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/%5d/) lm

Many potentially useful medicines arise from developing countries’ biodiverse environments and indigenous knowledge. However, global intellectual property rules have resulted in biopiracy, raising serious ethical concerns of environmental justice, exploitation, and health disparities in these populations. Furthermore, state-based approaches have not led to adequate biodiversity protection, management, or resource sharing, which affect access to lifesaving drugs.

In response, country delegates adopted the Nagoya Protocol, which aims at promoting biodiversity management, combating biopiracy, and encouraging equitable benefits sharing with indigenous communities. However, the effectiveness of this framework in meeting these objectives remains in question.

To address these challenges, we propose a policy building on the Nagoya Protocol that employs a World Health Organization–World Trade Organization Joint Committee on Bioprospecting and Biopiracy.

BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH AND the discovery and development of medicines often focus on naturally occurring materials for products and applications. Searching for such compounds in diverse environments (e.g., rainforests, deserts, and hot springs) is deemed “bioprospecting.”[1,2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib1) Bioprospecting has resulted in key advances (e.g., making polymerase chain reaction processes stable for medical application) and has led to life-saving advances in medicines and population health.[1](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib1) It has also established economic value for these resources and supported biodiversity conservation and indigenous communities.[2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib2)

However, biopiracy occurs when bioprospecting is used to appropriate knowledge and biodiversity resources to gain exclusive use through intellectual property rights (IPRs) without benefits for indigenous populations.[2,3](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib2) In addition to raising serious environmental justice issues, biopiracy adversely affects the health of local populations that fail to benefit from economic and medical gains derived from the biodiversity and indigenous knowledge that originated in their communities. The global health consequences of biopiracy include lack of access to medicines, failure to compensate for valuable traditional knowledge, and depletion of biodiversity resources that are needed by indigenous communities for their own ethnomedicine and health care. These impacts are particularly problematic because the health of these communities can be poor.[4](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib4) Because of the global nature of bioprospecting, biopiracy, and biodiversity, effective management—including environmental protection and sustainable development approaches—may be best performed through global governance.

Global governance, however, has been ineffective in protecting biodiversity from biopiracy. Global IPR rules comprise domestic, multilateral, and supranational systems that establish minimum intellectual property standards. These global IPR systems focus on patent systems and private economic development under the World Trade Organization (WTO) TRIPS regime (Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights) and on activities of the World Intellectual Property Organization. However, they have failed to protect indigenous rights, promote access to life-saving drugs, prevent biopiracy, or provide for responsible biodiversity development.[5–9](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib5) Governance relies on market forces and state entities of independent governments within a defined territory, which preclude the participation and protection of indigenous communities (both in developed and developing countries) that comprise groups of diverse social self-identification. This traditional state-focused governance model has not created incentives for developing countries to invest in adequate conservation, and thus, biodiversity resources in these countries are in danger of being depleted.[4,6](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib4)

Globalization and biotechnology have created vast, interdependent systems of economic trade in the life sciences. Accompanying this development is the globalization of intellectual property regimes, largely due to the efforts of organizations such as the WTO.[9](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib9) However, with expanded global economies made possible through multilateral agreements combined with international standardization of certain IPRs through TRIPS, serious questions regarding IPR distribution and biopiracy have arisen that relate to global equity and justice.[5](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib5)

Under the current system, WTO member states must implement minimum IPR protections, specifically including patentability of living organisms or their processes.[2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib2) However, these IPR processes, and the infrastructure to support them, are often beyond the capabilities of indigenous communities, significantly limiting their access to the legal rights afforded by these systems.[11](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib11) This has formalized bioprospecting and allowed companies to gain IPRs for biodiversity forms and their chemical structures, including in the formulation of medicines. This process has often involved the exploitation of indigenous knowledge, which may prevent indigenous communities from realizing social and financial benefits.[11](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib11) Indeed, even if bioprospecting and biopiracy only use small amounts of the biodiverse resource, uncompensated indigenous communities are often precluded from benefits that could underwrite important public health and biodiversity management efforts. Thus, alth[r]ough TRIPS has stimulated bioprospecting by pharmaceutical companies, it has also allowed them to commercialize and monopolize the use of prospected resources without benefits sharing, which is biopiracy.[11](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib11) This can have short-term and long-term implications for indigenous communities.

Instead, private IPR efforts have predominated, and biopiracy has created a global imbalance of benefits sharing, use, and products between developed and developing countries, especially in access to development of pharmaceuticals.[5](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib5) Indeed, under exclusivity provisions,[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib7) IPR owners may prevent local communities from legally using their own indigenous knowledge and ethnomedicine,[9](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib9) increasing locally produced medicine costs.[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib7) This is especially dire for developing countries, whose limited resources may preclude access to pharmaceuticals and the health care infrastructures to use them, and it further widens the gap in health disparities between rich and poor.

Developed countries also show a lack of cultural competence regarding indigenous communities’ IPR perspectives and understanding.[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib7) The concept of private commercial rights to intellectual property and medicine is primarily an idea adopted by developed countries and may not be understood by indigenous communities.[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib7) Such cultural nuances are not recognized by the current international IPR system,[13](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib13) where rights are governed by global legal regimes that do not allow local communities to be represented; consequently, indigenous community needs may not be heard or met.[14](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib14)

The protocol sets targets for preserving biodiversity and establishes rules on members’ cooperation in accessing biodiversity and sharing resource benefits.[10](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib10) The protocol also includes methods for providing compensation for traditional medical knowledge that is presently being used, patented, or sold, including indigenous knowledge and ethnomedicine obtained through bioprospecting.[10](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib10) Other efforts to preserve the rights of indigenous communities include emphasis on the fair and equitable sharing of financial and nonfinancial benefits with indigenous communities, access of indigenous knowledge only with adequate informed consent, designation of checkpoints to monitor compliance (including issuance of internationally recognized certificates of compliance), and community protocol development that includes minimal if any restrictions on indigenous communities’ right of customary use and ethnomedicine.[16](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib16) The protocol requires ratification by 50 nations before it can be implemented.[16](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3483946/#bib16)

Bioprospecting is a key strategy for promoting the private development of medicines to serve global populations. However, global governance to address biopiracy and sustainable biodiversity, including the recent Nagoya Protocol, still leaves unattended the key issues of outstanding concerns of indigenous communities, biopiracy, and limited resources for biodiversity management and public health infrastructure.

The time to focus on these issues is now. Such efforts are clearly relevant to current and forthcoming global discussions within and among states regarding ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. These debates have the significant potential to recognize the increasing importance of global cooperation in the development of life-saving medicines and clinical interventions through bioprospecting—from both an economic and global health viewpoint and a biodiversity-sustaining perspective. Core to these principles is the need to share biodiversity benefits equitably and to promote environmental justice and health equity for all. Through a health–economics policy that addresses biopiracy, such as the one we have proposed, bioprospecting can provide economic aid to indigenous communities, allow companies to responsibly develop medicines from these communities, and promote local and global health.

#### Biodiversity loss causes extinction.

**Torres 16** [Phil Torres, conservationist, science advocate, and educator, with a BS in entomology from Cornell, working on a PhD at Rice University in tropical conservation biology, 5-20-2016, "Biodiversity Loss: An Existential Risk Comparable to Climate Change," Future of Life Institute, [https://futureoflife.org/2016/05/20/biodiversity-loss/?cnreloaded=1]/](https://futureoflife.org/2016/05/20/biodiversity-loss/?cnreloaded=1%5d/) lm

The sixth extinction. The repercussions of biodiversity loss [is] are potentially as severe as those anticipated from climate change, or even a nuclear conflict. For example, according to a 2015 study published in Science Advances, the best available evidence reveals “an exceptionally rapid loss of biodiversity over the last few centuries, indicating that a sixth mass extinction is already under way.” This conclusion holds, even on the most optimistic assumptions about the background rate of species losses and the current rate of vertebrate extinctions. The group classified as “vertebrates” includes mammals, birds, reptiles, fish, and all other creatures with a backbone. The article argues that, using its conservative figures, the average loss of vertebrate species was 100 times higher in the past century relative to the background rate of extinction. (Other scientists have suggested that the current extinction rate could be as much a[i]s 10,000 times higher than normal.) As the authors write, “The evidence is incontrovertible that recent extinction [these] rates are unprecedented in human history and highly unusual in Earth’s history.” Perhaps the term “Big Six” should enter the popular lexicon—to add the current extinction to the previous “Big Five,” the last of which wiped out the dinosaurs 66 million years ago. But the concept of biodiversity encompasses more than just the total number of species on the planet. It also refers to the size of different populations of species. With respect to this phenomenon, multiple studies have confirmed that wild populations around the world are dwindling and disappearing at an alarming rate. For example, the 2010 Global Biodiversity Outlook report found that the population of wild vertebrates living in the tropics dropped by 59 percent between 1970 and 2006. The report also found that the population of farmland birds in Europe has dropped by 50 percent since 1980; bird populations in the grasslands of North America declined by almost 40 percent between 1968 and 2003; and the population of birds in North American arid lands has fallen by almost 30 percent since the 1960s. Similarly, 42 percent of all amphibian species (a type of vertebrate that is sometimes called an “ecological indicator”) are undergoing population declines, and 23 percent of all plant species “are estimated to be threatened with extinction.” Other studies have found that some 20 percent of all reptile species, 48 percent of the world’s primates, and 50 percent of freshwater turtles are threatened. Underwater, about 10 percent of all coral reefs are now dead, and another 60 percent are in danger of dying. Consistent with these data, the 2014 Living Planet Report shows that the global population of wild vertebrates dropped by 52 percent in only four decades—from 1970 to 2010. While biologists often avoid projecting historical trends into the future because of the complexity of ecological systems, it’s tempting to extrapolate this figure to, say, the year 2050, which is four decades from 2010. As it happens, a 2006study published in Science does precisely this: It projects past trends of marine biodiversity loss into the 21st century, concluding that, unless significant changes are made to patterns of human activity, there will be virtually no more wild-caught seafood by 2048. 48% of the world’s primates are threatened with extinction. Catastrophic consequences for civilization. The consequences of this rapid pruning of the evolutionary tree of life extend beyond the obvious. There could be surprising effects of biodiversity loss that scientists are unable to fully anticipate in advance. For example, prior research has shown that localized ecosystems can undergo abrupt and irreversible shifts when they reach a tipping point. According to a 2012 paper published in Nature, there are reasons for thinking that we may be approaching a tipping point of this sort in the global ecosystem, beyond which the consequences could be catastrophic for civilization. As the authors write, a planetary-scale transition could precipitate “substantial losses of ecosystem services required to sustain the human population.” An ecosystem service is any ecological process that benefits humanity, such as food production and crop pollination. If the global ecosystem were to cross a tipping point and substantial ecosystem services were lost, the results could be “widespread social unrest, economic instability, and loss of human life.” According to Missouri Botanical Garden ecologist Adam Smith, one of the paper’s co-authors, this could occur in a matter of decades—far more quickly than most of the expected consequences of climate change, yet equally destructive. Biodiversity loss is a “threat multiplier” that, by pushing societies to the brink of collapse, will exacerbate existing conflicts and introduce entirely new struggles between state and non-state actors. Indeed, it could even fuel the rise of terrorism. (After all, climate change has been linked to the emergence of ISIS in Syria, and multiple high-ranking US officials, such as former US Defense Secretary Chuck Hageland CIA director John Brennan, have affirmed that climate change and terrorism are connected.) The reality is that we are entering the sixth mass extinction in the 3.8-billion-year history of life on Earth, and the impact of this event could be felt by civilization “in as little as three human lifetimes,” as the aforementioned 2012 Nature paper notes. Furthermore, the widespread decline of biological populations could plausibly initiate a dramatic transformation of the global ecosystem on an even faster timescale: perhaps a single human lifetime. The unavoidable conclusion is that biodiversity loss constitutes an existential threat in its own right. As such, it ought to be considered alongside climate change and nuclear weapons as one of the most significant contemporary risks to human prosperity and survival.

### 1AC – Underview

#### 1] Aff gets 1ar theory, otherwise 1n can be infinitely abusive. 1ar theory is DTD and competing interps – fairness is voter b/c it’ debate is a game, if it’s unfair no-one will want to play, controls the internal link to education.

#### 2] No 2nr RVI, paradigm issues, or theory – they’d dump 6 mins and outspread my 3 min 2ar win every rnd. Yes RVIs for the aff – NC theory is unreciprical and a-priori rvi is k2 checking. Every neg interp is CI since aff has an implicit interp that we aren’t abusive since we wouldn’t do it and an explicit interp right here. Only our theory model solves, since we get equal time to debate NC theory, and 7-6 time skew on RVIs is better than 7-13 time skew on NC theory, and turns any response since we can’t engage with the theory if it creates an unsustainable neg bias.

#### 3] The advocacy is a conditional statement which asserts the consequent is true based on certain assumptions, but proving the antecedents false doesn’t disprove the aff.

Stanford [Stanford University, “An Introduction to Philosophy,” Abbreviated Dictionary of Philosophical Terminology, [https://web.stanford.edu/~bobonich/dictionary/dictionary.html]/](https://web.stanford.edu/~bobonich/dictionary/dictionary.html%5d/) lm

Conditional statement: an “if p, then q” compound statement (ex. If I throw this ball into the air, it will come down); p is called the antecedent, and q is the consequent.  A conditional asserts that if its antecedent is true, its consequent is also true; any conditional with a true antecedent and a false consequent must be false.  For [but] any other combination of true and false antecedents and consequents, the conditional statement is true.

#### That means a] presume aff since neg has a higher burden to disproving a conditonal, you assume statements true until proven otherwise, i.e. if I told you my name was Leo you’d believe it, and we wouldn’t be able to start a strand of reasoning otherwise.