# 1NC v Arun

## 1

#### 1] Interpretation - Reduce means permanent reduction – it’s distinct from “waive” or “suspend.”

**Reynolds 59** (Judge (In the Matter of Doris A. Montesani, Petitioner, v. Arthur Levitt, as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al., Respondents [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL] Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department 9 A.D.2d 51; 189 N.Y.S.2d 695; 1959 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 7391 August 13, 1959, lexis)

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway.  [\*\*\*13] The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency.

#### Waiver is temporary.

Green 5/6 [Andrew Green (Devex Contributing Reporter based in Berlin, his coverage focuses primarily on health and human rights and he has previously worked as Voice of America's South Sudan bureau chief and the Center for Public Integrity's web editor). “US backs waiver for intellectual property rights for COVID-19 vaccines”. Devex. 06 May 2021. Accessed 7/31/2021. <https://www.devex.com/news/us-backs-waiver-for-intellectual-property-rights-for-covid-19-vaccines-99847> //Xu]

In a stunning reversal, U.S. President Joe Biden’s administration came out in favor of waiving intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines Wednesday. The move follows months of U.S. opposition that began under former President Donald Trump to a proposal from South Africa and India to temporarily set aside intellectual property rights around products that would protect, contain, and treat COVID-19. Its supporters have argued that the proposal, first tabled at the World Trade Organization in October and now backed by more than 100 countries, is necessary to expand vaccine production and overcome global shortages.

#### 2] Violation – the plan waives intellectual property protections temporarily, which is an indefinite suspension. That’s 1AC [Young and Potts-Szeliga 21].

#### Plan Text in a Vacuum is a useless guideline since words are contextually defined based on function – the only basis for determining Topicality should be if the implementation of the Plan as per their 1AC solvency evidence follows the directional meaning of the Topic’s intent – anything else allows the 1AR to re-contextualize what the Plan says forcing the 1NC to predict infinite 1AR spin since they’re not tied to their evidence.

#### 3] Vote neg for limits and neg ground – re-instatement under any infinite number of conditions doubles aff ground – every plan becomes either temporary or permanent – you cherry-pick the best criteria and I must prep every aff while they avoid core topic discussions like reduction-based DAs which decks generics like Pharma Innovation and Bio-Tech.

#### 5] TVA solves – permanently reduce COVID patents.

#### 6] Paradigm Issues –

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

## 2

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, policies require positive justification and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation.

#### 2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### 3] Negating is harder – A] Aff gets first and last speech which control the direction of the debate B] Affirmatives can strategically uplayer in the 1ar giving them a 7-6 time skew advantage, splitting the 2nr C] They get infinite prep time

#### 4] Affirmation theory- Affirming requires unconditionally maintaining an obligation

Affirm [is to]: maintain as true.

That’s Dictionary.com- “affirm” https://www.dictionary.com/browse/affirm

#### Yes Act-Omission Distinction

#### 1] Infinite obligations – no act-omission means you’re culpable for every possible omission implying they’re immoral for debating instead of curing cancer which is untenable. Answering this means you negate – (a) The 1AC is suboptimal compared to some alternative (b) State action would be frozen b/c they wouldn’t be able to decide b/t alternatives so the plan wouldn’t pass and you vote on presumption.

#### 2] Trolley Problem – Omissions allow us to escape culpability in otherwise unavoidable situations like when someone pulls the lever to kill 1 instead of 2 – otherwise we’re always categorically wrong which makes morality inaccessible, only the distinction solves. O/ws on Bindingness, if an agent is permanently violating their ethical standard, they can’t take moral action.

#### Negate -- not reducing IPP is a legitimate moral action to avoid infinite culpability

## 3

#### We’re hijacking a priori morality first- that means intuitions

#### 1) Intuitions are defined a priori- some truths are intuitively clear.

**Parfit** [David Parfit(Senior Research Fellow @ Oxford). The Blackwell Guide to Ethical Theory. Second Edition. February 21, 2000. Accessed 1/8/20. <https://books.google.com/books?id=FcUi2AxNW3gC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false//> Recut Houston Memorial DX]

To introduce this argument, I shall sum up some of my claims. (A) There are some irreducibly normative reason-involving truths, some of which are moral truths. (B) Since these truths are not about natural properties, our knowledge of these truths cannot be based on perception, or on evidence provided by empirical facts. (C) Positive substantive normative truths cannot be analytic, in the sense that their truth follows from their meaning. Therefore (D) Our normative beliefs cannot be justified unless we are able to recognize in some other way that these beliefs are true. We do, I believe, have this ability. We have reasons to have certain normative beliefs, and we can respond to these reasons. Normative beliefs can also be self-evident, and intrinsically credible. One such belief is (E) Torturing children merely for fun is wrong. There are similar non-normative beliefs, such as (F) No statement can be both wholly true and wholly false. Since our normative beliefs are neither caused by what we believe, nor based on empirical evidence, we need another word to refer to our way of forming these beliefs. On the view that I have called Intuitionism: We have intuitive abilities to respond to reasons and to recognize some normative truths. Though it is intuitively clear that certain acts are wrong, most of our moral beliefs cannot depend only on such separate intuitions. We must also assess the strength of various conflicting reasons, and the plausibility of various principles and arguments, trying to reach what Rawls calls reflective equilibrium. This kind of intuitively-based reflective thinking is not only, as Scanlon writes, the best way of making up one’s mind about moral matters . . . it is the only defensible method. We have similar abilities to recognize truths about what is rational, and about what we have reasons to believe, and want, and do. Many recent writers reject such claims. Schiffer, for example, doubts that moral intuitions are worth discussing, and Field and Boghossian call the idea of rational intuition ‘obscurantist’ and ‘a mystery’. But these criticisms are aimed at the view that intuition is a special quasi-perceptual faculty. That is not the view that I am defending here. When I use the word ‘intuitive’, I mean what Boghossian means when he describes one of his claims as ‘intuitively plausible’ and ‘intuitively quite clear’. Intuitionism can also be challenged with claims about disagreement. When Boghossian denies that beliefs can be intrinsically credible, or self-evident, he points out that (G) different people might find conflicting beliefs self-evident. If we claim that we have some ability, however, it is no objection that we might have lacked this ability. Different people might have conflicting visual experiences, which were like dreams and hallucinations, and were not a source of knowledge. But that is not in fact true. Different people’s visual experiences seldom conflict, and believing what we seem to see is a fairly reliable way of reaching the truth. It may be similarly true that, after careful reflection, different people would seldom find conflicting beliefs self-evident. Believing what seems self- evident, after such reflection, may be another fairly reliable way of reaching the truth. When Schiffer argues that there are no moral truths, he claims that (H) even in ideal conditions, when everyone knows the relevant facts and is reasoning equally well, we and others could rationally disagree about any moral question. For example, Schiffer claims that, though we could rationally believe that (E) torturing children merely for fun is wrong, it would be equally rational to reject this belief. This claim assumes that we cannot have decisive reasons to have our moral beliefs. If we had such reasons to believe (E), it would not be equally rational either to have or to reject this belief. What Schiffer calls his error theory might be true, since we might never have decisive reasons to have any moral belief. But Schiffer cannot support this theory by claiming that we and others could rationally disagree about any moral question, since this claim assumes that we have no such reasons. Nor could we reject Schiffer’s theory merely by claiming that we and others could not rationally disagree. When we are trying to decide whether we have decisive reasons to have certain beliefs, we cannot usefully appeal to claims about whether, when considering these beliefs, we and others could rationally disagree.

#### 2) Reason exists in 2 forms, intuitive and reflective. If I say what is 1+1, the answer of 2 is intuitive ie you don’t need to think about it. If I say what is 5/11, this is reflective, because you need to go through a system of conscious steps to reflect upon it. However, every step made in a deductive syllogism should be intuitively true, so intuitions control the internal link to reflective reasoning.

#### Independently we’re hijacking Agrippan Skepticism- the Kantian notion of “asking why” leading to the concession the authority of reason conflates the difference between epistemological truth and moral truths. Thus, when asking why of moral truths, the only answer is that it is some way because it is intuitive which only non-naturalism based a priori intuitions can resolve.

#### Thus the standard is consistency with a priori intuitions.

#### We have an intuitive preference for the squo, that was their arg for presumption in the UV