# SO21 Kant NC Frontlines

## AT Other People Own It

#### (0:20) They don’t own the vaccine under Kant. Even if people contributed to making the vaccine that doesn’t mean they’re entitled to reduction of the patents. Someone like a volunteer agreed to test the vaccine for free or for money – not for reduced ip protections. They signed a contract – they help produce the vaccine, and in return they get money and nothing else, so there’s no contractual obligation for pharma companies to act and everything else is extra. Even if they did extra work, that’s outside the contract, so pharma companies aren’t obligated to pay them extra like how if you tip me for mowing your lawn, I don’t have to clean your house too.

## AT People Dying

#### A posteriori ethics fails – we can’t use our empirical experiences to guide action – people dying doesn’t matter, that’s a consequence – the state can’t use consequences to justify its actions which was the impact calc since we can only know intentions beforehand

#### Induction fails – we have no knowledge of whether these medicines will work; even if they have in the past, it’s not guaranteed in the future so you can’t assume that you’ll save lives

A posteriori consequences don’t matter

## AT State Obligation

\*\*\*refer to AT People Dying

#### (0:33) Extend the impact calc – ethics are based on intent, but the state does not have intentions and cannot know the intentions of other agents. Instead, the state acts a procedural mechanism to punish those who violate rights claims.

#### The state only exists to enforce burdens – that means that the priority of the state is to enforce the categorical imperative and any other actions are superfluous so contracts that violate the burdens the state is supposed to enforce are illegitimate. I.e., if the state recognizes that it is bad to actively intend to murder someone, even if I promise you to murder someone the state cannot force me to keep that promise because it is illegitimate given that it causes a violation of the imperative the state is supposed to enforce, regardless of whether promises should be kept.

#### Negate – insofar as I’ve proved my offense that taking away ip protections hurts property rights it proves that the contract that the state has signed to protect the people is not legitimate, so they don’t have to enforce it.

## AT Contracts

#### (0:16) Pharma companies do not have an expliclit contract with the people to reduce ip protections in exchange for monetary rewards. If people and the government have funded the vaccines, at best it’s for only the vaccines and not reduced ip protections so pharma companies don’t have an obligation to do the aff, and at worst it’s supererogatory because they chose to donate money – i.e. if I donate to charity I don’t own part of the charity because I donate under the assumption that I’m not getting anything back. Don’t let them say that ip is the only way to get vaccines out – if consequences fail then these are not predictable things. Fiat doesn’t solve – a) the WTO is the actor, not the pharma companies so anything else is extra topical and drop them b) promise breaking wasn’t in the 1ar, don’t let them extrapolate non-existent arguments

## AT Active Action

#### (0:15) Don’t let them say that companies putting protections on their intellectual property is an action because that’s not actively preventing someone from accessing the info. I.e., if I lock the door of my house, I am not taking an active action to eliminate trespassers, but if I shot someone who I thought would trespass then I would be. The latter is unkantian, but the former is not because only one of the actions intrinsically sets harming people as an end; pharma companies can’t know the effects that patents will have on others given that consequences are unpredictable.