### 1NC

### A. 1NC

#### A. Interpretation – medicine refers to substances only. Affirmatives must not reduce IP protections for other medicinal products.

Kurrer 21 [Christian Kurrer, Policy Analyst at European Parliament. "Medicines and Medical Devices," European Parliament, 05-2021, accessed 9-2-2021, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/50/medicines-and-medical-devices] HWIC

A. General rules on medicines

A medicinal product (medicine) is a substance or combination of substances that is used for the treatment or prevention of diseases in human beings. With the aim of safeguarding public health, the market authorisation, classification and labelling of medicines has been regulated in the EU since 1965. The evaluation of medicines has been centralised through the European Medicines Agency (EMA) since its creation in 1993 and a centralised authorisation procedure was put in place in 1995 to guarantee the highest level of public health and to secure the availability of medicinal products. The main pieces of legislation in this area are Directive 2001/83/EC[[1]](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/50/medicines-and-medical-devices" \l "_ftn1) and Regulation (EC) No 726/2004[[2]](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/50/medicines-and-medical-devices" \l "_ftn2), which lay down the rules for establishing centralised and decentralised procedures.

#### B. Violation: They spec defending native knowledge and patents

#### C. Reasons to prefer

#### 1. Limits -- allowing any patented medical device includes testing and screening methods, PPE, contact tracing software etc. which takes away generics like innovation bc that applies to pharmaceutical development not distribution of preventative measures which explodes neg prep burden

#### 2. Precision -- we cite the European Parliament which proves common usage in trade and the law -- predictability is k2 pre-tournament prep and deep clash around the core topic controversy. Reject counter-interps without a positive vision of the topic -- otherwise they can always shift the goalposts

#### D. Paradigm issues

#### 1. Drop the debater -- they skewed the debate from the 1AC and T indicts their advocacy

#### 2. Competing interps -- you can't be reasonably topical and reasonability invites judge intervention

#### 3. No RVIs -- forcing the 1NC to go all in kills substance education and discourages checking abuse

### T:

#### Interp: The affirmative must disclose the plan text and advantage area if they break a new aff

#### 1. Clash – having no idea what the debate will be about makes being vneg impossible – the aff gets plan text choice and infinite prep to craft the most strategic case. No disclosure makes this impossible to overcome b/c it means the neg only gets 4 mins of prep to answer a strategy that the AFF had 5 months to prep. they’ll say generics, but their model of debate means the neg has no time to cut an update to their generics specific to the AFF and we’ll lose every debate.

#### 2. Discourages tricks – plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot aff’s. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, the case should lose. The neg is entitled to some research time to make sure the AFF is inherent, topical, and controversial. Otherwise bad AFF’s can win on purely surprise factor, which is a bad model b/c it encourages finding the most fringe surprising case possible instead of a well researched and defensible aff.

#### Vote on substantive engagement: otherwise we’re speaking without debating and there’s nothing to separate us from dueling oratory. It also creates the most valuable long-term skills since we need to learn how to defend our beliefs in any context, like politics.

#### Drop the debater on new affs: Their lack of disclosure makes substance irreparable b/c our entire argument is that we did not have a basis to engage the aff to begin with.

#### Competing interps since reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge’s tolerance for questionable argumentation.

#### No RVIs:

#### A. They incentivize debaters to go all in in theory and bait it with abusive practices, killing substantive clash on other flows. B. They can run theory on me too if I’m unfair so 1) theory is reciprocal because we’re both able to check abuse and 2) also cures time skew because they can collapse in the 2ar to their shell.

#### Don’t let them get away with asserting funding and enforcement, that let’s them get away with saying generic statements like “we should solve climate change” without actually consider how feasible solving it is or what the consequences are, makes it impossible to negate since it steals ground

#### Their K method doesn’t solve the Aff’s impact, at best they win the round but that doesn’t solve setcol,that’s an independent reason to vote neg since it creates a Feel-Good Politics DA where they claim to solve violence and atrocities but they don’t actually solve anything

#### 2x Bind; if their discussion is enough to solve the topic then you can vote neg on presumption since there isn’t any need for the plan, if their discussion isn’t enough then vote neg since the aff is too weak to solve anything

#### There’s also the outing DA, if their method solves their impacts then their movement will inevitably be coopted by the patriarchy, that’s a reason to vote neg since their aff ensures gendered violence continues

#### They have no solvency since they can’t bring up a single instance of their method working so we have no idea how their method would solve IRL