#### Interpretation: The affirmative debater must defend reducing intellectual property protections for substances that treat diseases. To clarify, they may not defend substances that prevent diseases. Medicines treat diseases

Webster (Merriam Webster is America's leading and most-trusted provider of language information, accessed on 6-30-21, Merriam Webster, "Definition of MEDICINE,” https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/medicine)// ww pbj

Definition of medicine 1a: a substance or preparation used in treating disease cough medicine

#### And, Treatment is different than prevention

Pflanzer 20 (Lydia Ramsey Pflanzer is a healthcare editor for Business Insider. She joined Business Insider in 2015 after graduating from Northwestern University, 4-29-2020, accessed 6/30/21, "Scientists are racing to discover ways to treat and prevent coronavirus. Here's the difference between a treatment and a vaccine.," Business Insider, <https://www.businessinsider.com/whats-the-difference-between-a-vaccine-and-a-treatment-2020-4)//ww> pbj

Vaccines are used to prepare the body's immune system to fight off infections. They work by giving the body a small taste of what the virus is like so that way it can produce antibodies that fight off an intruding virus, ideally keeping people from falling ill. Some vaccines protect better than others, and they're typically administered across broad populations. There are vaccines for some infectious diseases, like the flu, smallpox, measles, and chickenpox. But others, like HIV and hepatitis C, don't have vaccines that protect against them. Vaccines that protect against two other deadly outbreaks, MERS and SARS, have yet to be approved after the outbreaks subsided. There are more than 70 potential coronavirus vaccines in the works, with a number in early human trials. Drugmakers are looking into ways to produce the billions of doses that might be needed to suppress the pandemic. Read more: There are more than 70 potential coronavirus vaccines in the works. Here are the top efforts to watch, including the 16 vaccines set to be tested in people this year. FILE - In this March 2020 photo provided by Gilead Sciences, a vial of the investigational drug remdesivir is visually inspected at a Gilead manufacturing site in the United States. Given through an IV, the medication is designed to interfere with an enzyme that reproduces viral genetic material. (Gilead Sciences via AP) FILE - In this March 2020 photo provided by Gilead Sciences, a vial of the investigational drug remdesivir is visually inspected at a Gilead manufacturing site in the United States. Given through an IV, the medication is designed to interfere with an enzyme that reproduces viral genetic material. (Gilead Sciences via AP) Associated Press Treatments, on the other hand, are meant to do just that: treat COVID-19, helping patients sickened by the virus survive and recover more quickly. Treatments for disease are there to lessen symptoms and ultimately improve the outcomes of a particular disease. Sometimes, medications can be used preventatively. For instance, patients with high cholesterol might be prescribed a medication called a statin to prevent heart attacks. Some potential coronavirus treatments are being studied to see if they can prevent people from contracting the virus in the first place. For COVID-19, researchers are testing everything from antimalarial medications to antivirals, to even common heartburn medications in hospitalized patients with the hopes that more patients will survive severe forms of the illness and potentially recover faster. Some are looking at ways to use patients' own bodies to fight the virus with antibody treatments.

#### Violation: Vaccines specifically are different from medicines

Immunize BC 20 (Immunize British Colombia is a collaborative project of the BC Ministry of Health, the BC Centre for Disease Control (an agency of the BC Provincial Health Services Authority), the regional health authorities (First Nations Health Authority, Fraser Health, Interior Health, Island Health, Northern Health and Vancouver Coastal Health), the BC Pharmacy Association and the Public Health Association of BC. Our mission is to improve the health of British Columbians by continuing to reduce the number of vaccine-preventable diseases, along with the illness, disability and death that they cause, What are vaccines?, Date last reviewed: Thursday, Mar 19, 2020, accessed on 6-30-21, <https://immunizebc.ca/what-are-vaccines)//ww> pbj

Vaccines are products that protect people against many diseases that can be very dangerous and even deadly. Different than most medicines that treat or cure diseases, vaccines prevent you from getting sick with the disease in the first place.

#### Prefer – A) Intent to delineate – this author compares vaccines vs medicines with the purpose of articulating their differences, which means it’s more specific B) Field Context – It’s from the centre of disease control which is most proximal to the medical industry that controls the legitimate definitions for the topic. We should listen to lawyers about law and medical professionals about what counts as medicine.

#### Standards:

#### [1] Limits – they explode the topic to include tons of substances that prevent disease rather than treat them like soap, medical supplies, or food and make it so there is *no* unified neg generics. The aff still gets the core of the topic lit: they get medicine, innovation, and global inequality. Explosion of aff ground makes neg prep burden impossible, either killing neg ground or forcing the neg to read generics that barely link, always letting aff win. Our interp solves – it establishes a clear bright-line for that gives the neg a chance to predict and prepare for every aff ahead of time. At best, the aff’s extra-T still links to all our offense since they can get extra-T advantages to solve disads and defend whatever they want, magnifying limits.

#### [2] Precision – not defending the text of the resolution justifies the affirmative doing away with random words in the resolution which a] means they’re not within the topic which is a voter for jurisdiction since you can only vote affirmative on the resolution and this debate never should have happened, b] they’re unpredictable and impossible to engage in so we always lose

#### Voters -

#### [1] Semantics first

#### a] Jurisdiction: They’re aff but not affirming the res. That’s an independent voter since the ballot asks who does the better debating in the context of the res.

#### b] The topic is the only shared basis we have for preround prep and in round clash on a stable advocacy. Pragmatics only matter if we have a topic to debate. It justifies the aff talking about whatever with zero neg prep or prediction which is the most unfair and uneducational

#### c] Neg definition choice: The aff should have defined medicines in the 1ac as their value, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition. This would be like reading a brand new util framework in the 1ar, which kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

[2] Fairness **and education first [a] Debate is a competitive activity governed by rules. You can’t evaluate who did better debating if the round is structurally skewed, so fairness comes prior to substantive debate. [a] Education is the only reason schools fund and it has out of round impacts.**

**DTD on neg theory [a] drop the argument incentivizes abusive affs that bait theory and then collapse to substance – means neg always loses. [b] AC’s have the advantage of being able to spam blippy and abusive topic interps in the AC that are really short – means each one becomes a no risk apriori issue.**

**No aff rvi’s: A. incentivizes aff to read abusive interps and arguments and just focus on prepping a long counterinterp to always win, B. creates a chilling effect – aff is uniquely dangerous on theory because they get to read a long counterinterp in the 1ar and then get the 2ar to collapse, weigh, and contextualize: negs would always be disincentives from reading theory against good theory debaters which leads to infinite abuse. C. RVI’s motivate the aff to go all in on theory in the 1a instead of both theory and substance which is worse for substantive education.**

**Prefer competing interps to reasonability because reasonability a. has no bright line for mitigating a shell b. invites huge judge intervention because thresholds for “unreasonable” abuse are different and c. creates a race to the bottom with both debaters being as abusive as they can conceivably justify.**

## Theory

#### Interpretation: If the affirmative defends a consequentialist framework, they must explicitly delineate which theory of the good they defend in the form of a text in the 1ac.

#### Each nuance of the ethic entails different obligations and would exclude different offense – there are 7 different versions.

**Mastin,** [Luke Mastin, Consequentialism, The basics of philosophy <http://www.philosophybasics.com/branch_consequentialism.html>]

Some **consequentialist theories include**: Utilitarianism, which holds that an action is right if it leads to the most happiness for the greatest number of people ("happiness" here is defined as the maximization of pleasure and the minimization of pain). **Hedonism**, **which** is the philosophy **[holds] that pleasure** **is** the **most important** pursuit of mankind, **and** that **individuals** **should** strive to **maximise** **their own total** **pleasure** (net of any pain or suffering). **Epicureanism** is a more moderate approach (which still seeks to maximize happiness, but which **defines happiness** more **as a** **state of tranquillity** than pleasure). **Egoism, which holds that an action is right if it maximizes good for the self.** Thus, Egoism may license actions which are good for an individual even if detrimental to the general welfare. **Asceticism**, in some ways, **the opposite of Egoism in that it describes a life characterized by abstinence from egoistic pleasures** especially **to achieve a spiritual goal. Altruism**, which **prescribes that an individual take actions that have the best consequences for everyone except for himself**, according to Auguste Comte's dictum, "Live for others". Thus, individuals have a moral obligation to help, serve or benefit others, if necessary at the sacrifice of self-interest. **Rule Consequentialism**, which is a theory (sometimes seen as an attempt to reconcile Consequentialism and Deontology), **[holds] that moral behaviour involves following certain rules**, but that those rules should be **chosen** based **on** the **consequences that** the selection of **those rules have**. Some theorists holds that a certain set of minimal rules are necessary to ensure appropriate actions, while some hold that the rules are not absolute and may be violated if strict adherence to the rule would lead to much more undesirable consequences. **Negative Consequentialism**, which **focuses on minimizing bad consequences rather than promoting good consequences**. This may actually require active intervention (to prevent harm from being done), or may only require passive avoidance of bad outcomes.

#### B. Violation: They don’t and maximizing expected well-being doesn’t cut it.

**Crisp**, Roger, "Well-Being", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*(Fall **2017** Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/well-being/>.

Well-being is most commonly used in philosophy to describe what is non-instrumentally or ultimately good *for* a person. **The question of what well-being consists in is of independent interest**, but it is of great importance in moral philosophy, especially **in the case of utilitarianism**, according to which the only moral requirement is that well-being be maximized. Significant challenges to the very notion have been mounted, in particular by G.E. Moore and T.M. Scanlon. **It has become standard to distinguish theories of well-being as either hedonist theories, desire theories, or objective list theories**. According to the view known as welfarism, well-being is the only value. Also important in ethics is the question of how a person’s moral character and actions relate to their well-being.

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Shiftiness – They can shift out of my turns based on whatever theory of the good they operate under due to the nature of a vague standard. Especially true because the warrants for their standard could justify different versions of consequentialism as coming first and I wouldn’t know until the 1ar which gives them access to multiple contingent standards.

#### 2. Strat – I lose 6 minutes of time during the AC to generate a strategy because I don't know what turns or strategy I can go for during the 1N absent which proves CX doesn’t check since it would occur after the skew.

#### 3. Resolvability – Makes the round irresolvable since we can’t weigh different mechanisms for the good – Benatar would probably link harder under a hedonistic conception of util – weighing ground is key since it ensures we can compare arguments that clash to access the ballot.

#### Voters –

## NC

#### Permissibility Negates –

#### [1] Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation[[1]](#footnote-1) which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility and proving one disproves the other two. Semantics o/w – a) it’s key to predictability since we prep based on the wording of the res and b) it’s constitutive to the rules of debate since the judge is obligated to vote on the resolutional text.

#### [2] Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.

#### [3] Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both the “P” and “~P” are true.

Determinism negates— The aff says IP ought to be, but the action of not reducing one is predetermined making statements that prescribe doing otherwise incoherent. Disproves obligations since there’s no way we could fulfill them

#### Determinism is true –

#### [1] Causality: The first law of thermodynamics holds that nothing can be created or destroyed, thus everything must have a cause if something cannot come from nothing. This means that either A) free will, which definitionally causes it self, is illogical as it does not have one or B) our free will is caused by something which is a contradiction and proves determinism true.

#### [2] The best neuroscientific, psychological, and medical evidence show free will doesn’t exist.

Andrea Lavazza, Neuroethics, Centro Universitario Internazionale, Arezzo, Italy, Free Will and Neuroscience: From Explaining Freedom Away to New Ways of Operationalizing and Measuring It, 2016, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4887467/> ///AHS PB BRACKETED FOR CLARITY

All these experiments seem to indicate that free will is an illusion. Yet, these relevant experiments can be interpreted in many ways. A possible view is that, in some way, determinism can be observed directly within ourselves. This interpretation might lead to the conclusion that free will is just an illusion. In fact, if one considers as a condition of free will the fact that it should be causa sui (i.e., it should be able to consciously start new causal chains), such a condition is incompatible with determinism as it is usually defined. For it, in fact, all events are linked by casual relations in the form of natural laws, which started long before we were born and which we cannot escape. However, determinism has generally been regarded as a metaphysical claim, not refutable by empirical findings. One could properly talk of automatism in the brain, not of determinism, based on the evidence available. (In any case, endorsing indeterminism might lead to consider our behavior as the causal product of choices that every time produce different results, as if we rolled a dice. This doesn’t seem to make us any freer than if determinism were overturned; cf. Levy, 2011). Most importantly, another feature of freedom seems to be a pure illusion, namely the role of consciousness. The experiments considered thus far heavily question the claim that consciousness actually causes voluntary behavior. Neural activation starts the decisional process culminating in the movement, while consciousness “comes after”, when “things are done”. Therefore, [and] consciousness cannot trigger our voluntary decisions. But the role of consciousness in voluntary choices is part of the definition of free will (but the very definition of consciousness is a matter of debate, cf. Chalmers, 1996). Empirical research in psychology also shows that our mind works and makes choices without our conscious control. As proposed by psychologist Wegner (2002, 2003, 2004) and Aarts et al. (2004), we are “built” to have the impression to consciously control our actions or to have the power to freely choose, even though all that is only a cognitive illusion. Many priming experiments show that people act “mechanically” (even when their behavior might appear suited to the environment and even refined). Automatic cognitive processes, of which we aren’t always aware, originate our decisions, and they were only discovered thanks to the most advanced scientific research. Ultimately, consciousness, which should exercise control and assess the reasons for a choice, is thus allegedly causally ineffective: a mere epiphenomenon, to use the terminology of the philosophy of mind. This is what has been called Zombie Challenge, “based on an amazing wealth of findings in recent cognitive science that demonstrate the surprising ways in which our everyday behavior is controlled by automatic processes that unfold in the complete absence of consciousness” (Vierkant et al., 2013).

[3] Logic — We can make true claims about the future. “I will have eggs for breakfast tomorrow” Maybe I don’t know if that prediction is correct or not, but it is in fact either correct or incorrect. And if statements about the future are already true or false then there’s no chance things will turn out differently

## **ROB**

### ROB

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolutional statement is true or false by a substantively justified ethical framework:

**1. Inclusion: a) other ROBs open the door for personal lives of debaters to factor into decisions and compare who is more oppressed which causes violence in a space where some people go to escape. b) Anything can function under truth testing insofar as it proves the resolution either true or false. Specific role of the ballots exclude all offense besides those that follow from their framework which shuts out people without the technical skill or resources to prep for it.**

**2. Isomorphism: ROBs that aren’t phrased as binaries maximize leeway for interpretation as to who is winning offense. Scalar framing mechanisms necessitate that the judge has to intervene to see who is closest at solving a problem. Truth testing solves since it’s solely a question of if something is true or false, there isn’t a closest estimate.**

**3. Constitutivism: The ballot asks you to either vote aff or neg based on the given resolution a) Five dictionaries[[2]](#footnote-2) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[3]](#footnote-3) as to prove true which means its intrinsic to the nature of the activity b) the purpose of debate is the acquisition of knowledge in pursuit of truth. It’s a jurisdictional issue since it questions whether the judge should go outside the scope of the game.**

1. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)