**Interpretation: Debaters must specify a definition of “reduce” in a delineated text in the 1ac.**

**Violation: They don’t**

**No consistent definition of reduce**

**Word Hippo “What is another word for reduce”, [https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html] // Swickle**

To decrease in amount or degree To lower in length or size [To summarize](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-3) [To bring to an undesirable state](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-4) [To lower in volume](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-5) [To lower in rank](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-6) [To lower in price](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-7) (*cooking*) [To thicken a liquid through heating](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-8) (*of weight*) [To get rid of](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-9) [To financially cripple](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-10) [To forcibly impose obedience or servitude upon](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-11) [To decrease in strength or intensity](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-12) [To cause damage to, or have a diminishing effect on](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-13) [To cause to become physically weaker](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-14) [To compress, crush or squeeze something, altering its shape in the process](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-15) [To represent in a particular style](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-16) [To be economical or frugal with](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-17) [To separate or cause to be separated into constituent parts or components](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-18) [To make oneself thinner, especially by dieting](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-19) [Restrict oneself to small amounts or special kinds of food in order to lose weight](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-20) [To melt a substance, especially metal](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-21) [To prepare food for consumption, usually using heat](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-22) [To slow the growth or progress of, or to keep under control](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-23) [To eat (something) steadily and often audibly](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-24) [React or alter](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-25) [To undermine, especially someone's mood, ideas or feelings](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-26) [To separate or reduce into atoms](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-27) [Simplify (something) so much that a distorted impression of it is given](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-28) [To neutralize or cancel by exerting an opposite and equal force](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-29) [To become something different](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-30) [To bring disrepute to, especially through aspersions](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-31) [To render comprehensible or understandable](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-32) [To steal the limelight from](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-33) [Assess financial value](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-34)

**Standards:**

**[1] Stable ground: If they don’t specify they can say perm do the cp against every advantage and process counterplan that reforms the system of IPR because it would count as a reduction – only spec ensures we don’t lose after the 1nc from affs shifting the goalposts. Normal means doesn’t solve bc they will contest it in the 1ar and change their strategy based on the 1nc.**

**[2] Shiftiness: they can redefine how the aff enacts the plan ie what reduce means in the 1ar which decks strategy and allows them to wriggle out of negative positions which strips the neg of any DA that is hedged on the reduction of ip which is basically every single DA.**

**CI – a) brightlines are arbitrary and self-serving which doesn’t set good norms b) it collapses since weighing between brightlines rely on offense defense**

**Neg theory is drop the debater – a) Prep skew – aff’s infinite prep means they can frontline every shell marginally enough to be efficient at DA and skew substance enough to deflate theory and win b) 1AR Flex – It’s key to check 1ar flexibility since you can moot all 6 min of my offense and restart the debate on unpredictable layers while kicking the arguments that were abusive.**

**No rvis**

**[a] Baiting—they’ll bait the theory debate and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse since they’ll get away with unacceptable practices every time.**

**[b] 1AR all-outs—they’ll collapse entirely to theory which crowds out substance and kills education.**

**[c] Chilling effect—people will be scared to read theory since they can lose off of it, so no one will check abuse.**

**[d] Norm-setting—I shouldn’t be forced to keep advocating for a bad norm if I realize it’s bad in the middle of the round. Then bad norms would be spread.**

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best proves the truth or falsity of the Resolution; the affirmative must prove it true and the negative must prove it false. Prefer:

**A) Text: Five dictionaries define negate as to deny the truth of and affirm as to prove true which means the sole judge obligation is to vote on the resolution’s truth or falsity. Constitutivism outweighs because you don’t have the jurisdiction not to truth test. Jurisdiction is a meta constraint since every argument you make concedes the authority of the judge fulfilling their jurisdiction to vote aff if they affirm better and neg the contrary.**

**B) Logic: Any counter role of the ballot collapses to truth testing because every property assumes truth of the property i.e. if I say, “I am awake” it is the same as “it is true that I am awake” which means they are also a question of truth claims because it’s inherent.**

**C) Ground: Any offense can function under truth testing whereas your specific role of the ballot excludes all strategies but yours. This is bad for education because me engaging in a debate I know nothing about doesn’t help anyone.**

**D) Truth Testing is a prerequisite to other role of the ballots because without truth we’re operating off of lies which is what fuels propaganda and oppression.**

**Presumption Negates**

**1. We presume things false, this is why people don’t believe things like conspiracy theories.**

**2. There are an infinite number of ways to prove something false and only one way to prove it true.**

**3. The neg burden is to deny the evidence of truth so if there’s no offense as to why the resolution is true the neg has fulfilled their burden.**

**Permissibility Negates**

**1. The aff must prove an obligation because ought indicates a moral obligation. If an action is permissible, definitionally, no obligation is present and you negate.**

**The metaethic is fictionalism. The view that external moral doctrines are arbitrary, and non binding. This means ethics must be internally created by specific individuals depending on their individual circumstances. Prefer:**

**We must internalize and care about external claims, which means external motivation collapses.**

**Joyce 1**, Richard (Professor of Philosophy at Victoria University Wellington, New Zealand). The Myth of Morality. 2001. [Bracketed for grammatical clarity] // ICW NW

Back to the [Suppose] external reason[s]. **Suppose it were claimed,** instead, that **I have a reason to refrain from drinking the coffee because it is tapu** and must not be touched. This reason claim will be urged regardless of what I may say about my indifference to tapu, or my citing of nihilistic desires to tempt the hand of fate. **[r]egardless of my desires (it is claimed) I ought not drink** - l have a reason not to drink. But how could that reason ever explain any action of mine? Could the external reason even explain my [action] from drinking? Clearly, in order to explain it the external reason must have some causally efficacious role [in] among the antecedents of the action (in this case, an omission) — l must have. in some manner. "internalized" it. **The only possibility, it would seem, consistent with its being an external reason, is that I believe the external reason** claim [but] : I believe that the coffee is tapu. There's no doubting that such a belief can play a role in explaining actions - including my refraining from drinking the coffee. The question is whether the belief alone can[not] produce action, to which the correct answer is “No.” A very familiar and eminently sensible view says that **in order to explain an action** the **belief must couple with desires** (such that those same desires had in the absence of the belief would not have resulted in the action). And this seems correct: **if I believe that the coffee is** [bad] **tapu but really just don’t care about that, then I will not refrain from drinking it.** So in order for the belief to explain action it must couple with [desire] elements - but **in that case** the putative **external reason collapses into** an **internal** one.3

**Contracts solve this because people agree to certain constraints to better promote their self interest. People agree to channel their desires and in doing so, establish a set of moral agreements.**

**Gauthier 86** Gauthier, David P. *Morals by Agreement*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986. Print. // ICW NW

**Moral principles are introduced as the objects of** full **voluntary** ex ante a**greement among** rational **persons.** Such agreement is hypothetical, in supposing a pre-moral context for the adoption of moral rules and practices. But the **parties to agreement are real,** determinate individuals, **distinguished by their capacities, situations, and concerns.** In so far as **[Since] they** would **agree to constraints on their choices, restraining their pursuit of their own interests, they acknowledge a distinction between what they may and may not do.**  As rational persons understanding the structure of their interaction, **they recognize** for mutual constraint, and so for **a moral dimension in their affairs.**

**Thus, the standard is consistency with the contractarian principle of mutual restraint, this is when people agree to constrain their actions for their own self interest. To clarify, obligations arise from restraints we place on ourselves by entering contracts.**

**Prefer:**

**1. Bindingness: Contracts are binding since there are legal repercussions to not following them. This outweighs because if people don’t have any reason to follow ethics they can just not follow it the second they don’t want to and it loses all meaning.**

**2. Them contesting my framework concedes it’s validity since contracts were fundamental to any of their cards. For example, your authors needed publishing licenses, and your empirical studies needed permits.**

**Contention 1) Patents are contracts, between companies and the government in which the government gives companies protections and exclusive rights to a thing and in return companies make that thing. This is an instance of mutual restraint and as a result it’s immoral to violate patents.**

**Contention 2) The TRIPS agreement, which is a binding contract agreed to by members of the world trade organization, grants intellectual property rights to medicines.**

**Supakankunti,** Siripen, **et al.** "Impact of the World Trade Organization TRIPS Agreement on the Pharmaceutical Industry in Thailand." *World Health Organization Bulletin*, 20**01**, www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2566431/pdf/11417042.pdf. Accessed 14 Sept. 2021. ICW NW

In 1947, a total of 23 countries signed the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The primary objective was to promote and regulate the liberalization of international trade through rounds of trade negotiations. Between 1986 and 1994 the UruguayRound of Multilateral Trade Negotiations led to the Marrakech Agreements. These established the World Trade Organization (WTO) and extended the rules governing commercial relations between trading partners to a number of new areas, such as agriculture, services, investment measures and the protection of intellectual property rights. All of these areas had previously been excluded from trade liberalization. Since 1994, attention has focused on the WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual PropertyRights **(TRIPS)** as **the most far-reaching international instrument ever negotiated in this field.** It **establishes minimum universal standards in all areas of intellectual property** and the intention is to implement these standards globally through a strong enforcement mechanism established in WTO. **The TRIPS agreement requires universal patent protection for any invention in any field of technology. This affects pharmaceuticals,** which many countries had previously excluded from patent protection in order to produce drugs at reduced prices and thereby contribute to the improvement of public health. **WTO member countries that did not previously recognize pharmaceutical patents must amend their patent legislation within a limited time or transition period. Any Member country failing to bring its patent law into conformity with the TRIPS agreement,** if challenged by another member country, **is subject to the WTO dispute settlement system. Sanctions may be established** in accordance with WTO procedures. The TRIPS patent system can be expected to have a great impact on the health sector and may negatively affect national drug production, drug prices, the availability of essential medicines and pharmaceutical technology, and numerous other factors in developing and least developed countries. In addition, there could be a greater concentration of drug production in industrial countries rather than a transfer of technology to, or foreign direct investment (FDI) in developing countries. No extensive review of the practical implications of the TRIPS agreement has been conducted at the global and national levels, and at the regional level onlyLatin America has been covered. The present paper examines the consequences of the agreement for the pharmaceutical industry in Thailand with a view to learning lessons applicable to all developing countries. Recommendations are given for alleviating the potential negative impact resulting from mandates set forth in the agreement. In order to determine the specific implications and potential consequences accurately and meaningfully, we identified applicable and clearly defined objectives. Relevant research methods were employed, including situation and data analyses, surveys and impact assessments, and literature reviews. The situation and data analyses and the impact assessments dealt with the effect of the 1992 Thai Patent Law on the pharmaceutical industry in Thailand and on direct foreign investment and the transfer of technology in the sector. For the first time this law covered the protection of rights for both pharmaceutical processes and products.
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