## T

**Interpretation- Debaters must defend a reduction in intellectual property protection on medicines.**

**Violation-**

**Reduce is not eliminate**

**Words and Phrases 1914**, [<http://books.google.com/books?printsec=frontcover&id=IJMNAAAAYAAJ#v=onepage&q&f=false>] // Swickle

REDUCE Rev. Laws, c. 203, § 9, provides that, if two or more cases are tried together in the superior court, the presiding judge may "reduce" the witness fees and other costs, but "not less than the ordinary witness fees, and other costs recoverable in one of the cases" which are so tried together shall be allowed. Held that, in reducing the costs, the amount in all the cases together is to be considered and reduced, providing that there must be left in the aggregate an amount not less than the largest sum recoverable In any of the cases. The word "reduce," In its ordinary signification, does not mean to cancel, destroy, or bring to naught, but to diminish, lower, or bring to an inferior state. Green v. Sklar, 74 N. E. 595, 596, 188 Mass. 303.

**Reduce is not eliminate**

**Michigan District court**, (“SAGINAW OFFICE SERVICE, INC., Plaintiff, v. BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., Defendant. Civil Action No. 09-CV-13889 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION,” Lexis) [https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCOURTS-mied-4\_09-cv-13889/pdf/USCOURTS-mied-4\_09-cv-13889-2.pdf] // Swickle

In determining whether the words "reduce" and "adjust" are ambiguous, the Court is directed to consider the ordinary meanings of the words, Rory, 703 N.W.2d at 28, and to harmonize [\*11] the disputed terms with other parts of the contract, Royal, 706 N.W.2d at 432 ("construction should be avoided that would render any part of the contract surplusage or nugatory"). "When determining the common, ordinary meaning of a word or phrase, consulting a dictionary is appropriate." Stanton v. City of Battle Creek, 466 Mich. 611, 647 N.W.2d 508 (Mich. 2002). The Court finds that the plain meanings of these terms do not unambiguously support the Bank's position. The dictionary definition of "adjust" is to "adapt" or "to bring to a more satisfactory state." Webster's Third New Int'l Dictionary 27 (2002) ("Webster's"). This is a fairly broad definition, which may be subject to, alternatively, narrower or more expansive scope. To say that the complete eliminationof a schedule brings it to a more satisfactory state is undoubtedly an expansive viewof adjustment. It is the Court's duty to determine the intent of the contracting parties from the language of the contract itself, Rory, 703 N.W.2d at 30 ("the intent of the contracting parties is best discerned by the language actually used in the contract"), and in this case, it cannot unambiguously be said that the sense in which the parties used these [\*12] terms embraces the Bank's more expansive definition. Likewise, "reduce" means "to diminish in size, amount, extent, or number,"Webster's, at 1905, but the term does not, in the context of the TSA, unambiguously embody an expansive scope that views complete deletion as a subset of diminution.

**Standards**

**[1] Semantics are a constraint on voting aff:**

**[A] Jurisdiction: They’re aff but not affirming the res. That’s an indepdent 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 inround clash on a stable advocacy. Pragmatics only matter if we have a topic to debate.**

**[2] Limits: Being able to defend something not topical allows you to choose any scenario in the world with no limits. Kills fairness since I have to prep for every aff while they have to prep for one. Even if there are some responses, the NC will always get destroyed by 1AR frontlines to generics. Also kills education because it forces a lack of engagement, resulting in up layering and shallow debates – outweighs – even if your interp is best for education we don’t access it since I can’t engage.**

**[3] Topic lit: the literature talking about intellectual property rights is about reductions of intellectual property rights ie the TRIPS waiver. Topic lit is key to a. predictability- what we prep is based on the literature that we read and find on the internet and b. real world education- everyone in the real world is advocating for a reduction of ip rights so we should to. Real world education ows other types of education since the only reason we learn stuff is so we can apply it to the real world.**

**[4] Ground: full elimination takes away neg K and CP ground and makes it aff arguments - on a topic that is already super aff skewed in terms of persuasive literature, the neg has to be able to argue the aff doesn't go far enough. It also moots DAs- DAs are written in the context of a reform not an elimination. Even if our links would hypothetically be stronger, we havent prepped those links because they were unpredictable.**

## Shell

**A. Interpretation: Debaters who make presumption arguments must specify in the text of the AC [in the form of a list] the set of conditions under which presumption can become relevant in the evaluation of the round. *[i.e. if there is some kind of defense to the AC framework or NC framework which “triggers,” someone fails to extend offense, skepticism, utilitarianism, I won’t trigger presumption – it’s a preempt, drop the advocacy T + winning the framework debate etc.]***

**B. Violation: they didn’t**

**C. Standards:**

**1. Contestation – the ability for me to contest the implications of presumption and way it flows or form a strategy to engage the aff depends on my knowing what kind of arguments are enough to justify the judge voting on presumption. This is key to fairness since it skews the ability for me to contest the argument, resolve competing claims about presumption, or figure out how to respond to the aff.**

**2. Stable Implications – absent specification of these conditions you can choose whether and how to go for presumption based on my NC strat [examples] This kills fairness since your 1ar can shift the implication depending on what’s most strategic on theory. You’re incentivized to trigger an argument [since I can no longer contest it] which gives them bidirectional ground and moots neg offense and strategy – [making each presumption trigger a no-risk voting issue]. I don't know if or when they will trigger presumption or how the judge will use presumption to evaluate certain debates, which increases intervention. My interp encourages better quality ground by forcing debaters to go for offensive arguments unless they’re held to what they say in the AC.**

## ROB

#### The role of the ballot is to endorse the debater who proves the truth or falsity of the resolution –

#### 1. Text – five dictionaries define negate as to deny the truth of . Text first – Text comes first – a) Controls the internal link to fairness since it’s the basis of things like predictability and prep b) Key to jurisdiction since the judge can only endorse what is within their burden c) Even if another role of the ballot is better for debate, that is not a reason it ought to be the role of the ballot, just a reason we ought to discuss it. c) no 1ar rob

**NC**

**The standard is consistency with the standpoint of the skeptic.**

**Prefer –**

1. **TJFs – A) Ground – It’s the only standard that has equal quality and quantity ground on both sides since if another framework is normative it would prescribe an absolute correct obligation to do either the aff or neg, but skep allows debaters to make arguments without a truth quality to them which means its purely a test of skill B) Phil ed – All moral frameworks begin from the question of how to resolve skepticism which means it controls the internal link to all other framework education C) Real-world – Interrogating the internal warrants of every arguments’ foundation is key to developing advocacy skills for responding to everyone who disagrees by being able to answer all their objections**

#### The Skeptic would argue –

**1] Culpability – Ethics must hold agents culpable as otherwise we cannot be responsible for moral wrongdoings since they occur externally to our wills and will happen regardless of whether we advise against them. However, willing fails and agents lack control.**

Coyne 12 **Jerry Coyne, [Professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at The** [**University of Chicago**](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Schools/University+of+Chicago)**], “Why You Don’t Really Have Free Will,” *USAToday*, January 1st, 2012** [**https://www.ethicalpsychology.com/2013/12/why-you-dont-really-have-free-will.html?m=1**](https://www.ethicalpsychology.com/2013/12/why-you-dont-really-have-free-will.html?m=1)

The first is simple: **we are biological** creatures, **collections of molecules that must obey the laws of physics**. **All the success of science rests on the regularity of those laws, which determine the behavior of every molecule in the universe.** Those molecules, of course, also make up your brain — the organ that does the "choosing." And **the neurons and molecules in your brain are the product of both your genes and your environment,** an environment including the other people we deal with. Memories, for example, are nothing more than structural and chemical changes in your brain cells. **Everything that you** think, say, or **do, must come down to molecules and physics.** True "**free will**," then, **would require us to somehow step outside of our brain's structure and modify how it works**. Science hasn't shown any way we can do this because "**we" are simply constructs of our brain.** We can't impose a nebulous "will" on the inputs to our brain that can affect its output of decisions and actions, any more than a programmed computer can somehow reach inside itself and change its program.

. Note that such epistemological moral skepticism is different from (4a), the skeptical conclusion that Street regards as implausible or far-fetched.

**3] Moral facts are impossible due to the is/ought gap**

**Gray [Bracketed for clarity]** Grey, JW. "The Is/Ought Gap: How Do We Get "Ought" from "Is?"" *Ethical Realism*. N.p., 19 July 2011. Web. 28 Oct. 2015. https://ethicalrealism.wordpress.com/2011/07/19/the-isought-gap-how-do-we-get-ought-from-is/

How is the is/ought gap evidence of moral anti-realism? Moral anti-realists think that there are no irreducible [moral facts](https://ethicalrealism.wordpress.com/2011/07/19/2010/11/04/what-are-moral-facts/)—all moral truths can be reduced to our beliefs, desires, commitments, and so on. Anti-realists don’t think that anything is right or wrong apart from something like a social contract—it’s practical to commit ourselves to behaving ethically insofar as we will benefit when everyone else makes the same commitment as well. Three reasons that the is/ought gap is often taken to be evidence for anti-realism is because (a) the anti-realist sees no reason to think that what morally ought to be the case is a “moral fact” beyond our beliefs, desires, and commitments; (b) the anti-realist sees no reason to think that we could ever know such moral facts exist; and (c) the anti-realist solutions to the is/ought gap could be superior to the realist solutions. Is what morally ought to be the case a moral fact? Facts are states of affairs—actual things that exist and relations between things that exist. That a cat is on the mat is a fact. It’s unclear how what morally ought to be the case can be a fact. What morally ought to be is often quite different from the actual state of affairs in the world. A thief steals, a murderer kills, and so on. People aren’t actually doing what they ought to do. How can a[n] state of affairs that ought to exist be said to be a fact when what ought to be the case is often quite different from what actually [is] exists or happens in the world? Anti-realists see no good answers for these questions, but they think anti-realism can solve the problem by avoiding it. If there are no moral facts, then we no longer need to answer these questions. How can we know what morally ought to be the case? Hume was an empiricist, so he thought we could only know about reality through observation. What we observe isn’t necessarily what ought to be. The actual state of affairs in the world can be quite different that what people morally ought to do. We do know what is the case because we can observe it. Looking at what is the case—the actually obtaining nonmoral facts—doesn’t seem to tell us what ought to be the case. So, it’s not obvious how we can know what morally ought to be the case assuming that it’s a moral fact. Anti-realists think that we can avoid this problem entirely by becoming anti-realists and admitting there are no moral facts.

**Thus, I contend the skeptic would negate the resolution.**

**1. The skeptical conclusion being true triggers permissibility: It denies that moral obligations exist. That negates – A) 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 B) 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**

## Case

### Hijack

**Panpsychism is true: Something cannot come from nothing - A object cannot be created from a substance that doesn’t have the properties to create it. (ie we cannot create a wooden door without wood) therefor in order for a mind to be created it must be formed of mind like structures, if this is the case, everything that has a mind must be created from substances that also have minds, therefor it is either the case that nothing has a mind and it was never created, or it is the case that everything has a mind- since we agree that humans have a mind, every object made of the same particles a mind is, must have minds in and of themselves. This means that all matter is capable of practical reason: That negates 1] removing patents on medicine violates medicine freedom cuz they aren’t protected 2] the practical steps to pass the aff require you to violate the freedom of matter like paper and the floor.**

1. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)