**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.**

1 <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>

*2 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*

**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.**

**Impact Calc:**

**My framework only cares about whether or not the resolution is consistent with or inconsistent with actual contracts. The aff must prove a contract binds states to remove patent protections, anything less than that doesn’t prove the resolution obligatory.**

**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.

**On Case:**

**Overview: They don't affirm their advocacy. A) Check the doc. They concede that they just state the current state of affairs is unethical. This means they don't defend a proactive policy. B) They don't read solvency, just one card pointing out an issue. It doesn't follow that the WTO should be the actor, that patents should be reduced in general or for all people. This has three implications. First, They don't affirm. Just pointing out an issue isn't' sufficient to affirm without a METHOD to solve it. They don't prove their advocacy text. Second, terminal defense. There's no solvency in the AC to solve the impact in the offense. There is no solvency card and they don't prescribe an action. Third, err HEAVILY neg on turns. If I win any risk of offense to their framework vote neg. They don't prove why the aff world is good at all, just why a problem exists. If I win why patents are good then I win under their framework.**

**Contention:**

**1. Waiving patents slows distribution of vaccines to developing countries.**

**Winegarden**, Wayne, et al. "Waiving Covid-19 Vaccine Patents Is a Bad Idea and Sets a Dangerous Precedent." Center for Medical Economics and Innovation, 21 June 20**21**, medecon.org/waiving-covid-19-vaccine-patents-is-a-bad-idea-and-sets-a-dangerous-precedent/. Accessed 21 Sept. 2021.

It all sounds so simple: to hasten the end of the pandemic globally, suspend intellectual property protections on Covid-19 vaccines to allow swift production of low-cost copies the world over. The Biden administration has bought into exactly that strategy at the World Trade Organization. But some simple ideas are also simplistic, and this one is dangerously so. **Waiving patent rights for Covid-19 vaccines will** actually **slow their availability in the developing world,** thereby **prolonging the pandemic. The production of these breakthrough Covid-19 vaccines requires sophisticated processes, procedures,** staff **training, material, and manufacturing. Under typical patent-protected arrangements** for new global production facilities, **patent-holders voluntarily license their product information to qualified third party-manufacturers. The patent-owners work closely with the licensees to stand up facilities that meet rigorous technological specifications and standards for safety.** Even under ideal conditions, it can take a year or longer to build out this infrastructure the right way. **The WTO waiver blows up this careful process by allowing pretty much anyone to go into the business of producing Covid-19 vaccines. Suddenly, it’s the wild west** out there, **with legitimate producers trying to compete with aggressive cost and corner-cutters, to say nothing of the outright fraud that has long driven the lucrative counterfeit drug trade.** All the research demonstrating the safety and efficacy of the Covid-19 vaccines goes out the window under such conditions. Nor is such a process going to produce faster results. **Historically, under compulsory rather than voluntary licensing arrangements, it has taken even legitimate generic manufacturers years to receive** the **formulas, work out logistical challenges, and scale up production.** In one case of compulsory licensing, it took over four years to bring a generic AIDS drug to Rwanda. The World Health Organization regularly publishes a list of “essential” medications, the vast majority of which patent protections have long expired. Any generic manufacturer can therefore set itself up producing them. Yet the WHO reports that availability of these medicines in many parts of the developing world remains spotty, at best. The quality of many of these essential medicines is also questionable. Yet none of the drugs on the WHO list are in the same universe of complexity as the Covid-19 vaccines. **The patent system is not the problem here.** But, some ask, why should private companies enjoy the property rights to innovation driven by government funding? This question likewise misses the mark. In a study of 478 drugs less than 10 percent had a public-sector patent associated with it. While providing no gain, compulsory licensing promises lots of pain. Shunting aside patent and intellectual property rights sends a dangerous signal to innovative biopharmaceutical companies and their investors. Biopharmaceutical research is risky. It costs almost $3 billion, on average, to bring a single medicine to pharmacy shelves. Biotech investors take these risks because of strong patent protection like those in the United States. Scientists in America now develop over half of all new drugs worldwide. It’s important to understand the current advocacy for a “temporary” IP waiver. A small but vocal and influential public health policy cohort believes that IP protections are the most significant cause of global healthcare disparities. Their philosophies repeat and reinforce many misconceptions about the problem of improving global access to medicines. The reality is that, **in order to save the world, we must all work together as partners. A free-market healthcare paradigm for drug development,** although far from perfect, **works. A well-appointed armamentarium of Covid-19 diagnostic tools, therapeutics, and vaccines – all invented in under one year, speaks to the power of today’s innovation ecosystem. That ecosystem is built on IP protections.** Right now, under voluntary licensing, global production capacity for Covid vaccines and treatments is expanding and accelerating. **A move to nullify IP will not result in a single resident of the developing world getting vaccinated one minute sooner.**

**This outweighs:**

**2. Turn: This card doesn’t say patent protections are bad, just that specific applications are bad. The aff is net worse because you don’t acknowledge who’s knowledge it is you just permentantly cement that indigenous people don’t have access.**

**3. Ruse of solvency: you claim to solve an overarching structure but just get rid of some patents. This turns and outweighs case because people walk away thinking they solved the problem when they didn’t.**

**4. This card isn’t about patents or medicine. It literally just says indigenous knowledge gets coopted by Europeans but not why this means things like Pfizer patenting the covid vaccine is racist.**

**5. Turn: Patents are good because they increase access to medicine. Outweighs on materiality because indigenous people and people of color need things like vaccines.**

**6. Turn: Patents give everyone an equal access to information. E.g. if you come up with something you apply for a patent and fill out the paperwork. The alternative is there are no legal methods of protecting indigenous knowledge and means settlers can still do what they do in the squo but indigenous people have no legal protections.**

**On Framing**

**Calc Indicts:**