### T Waiver

#### Affirmatives must defend the reduction of intellectual property protections for medicine.

#### Medicine treats disease **Merriam-Webster n.d.**

[https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/medicine]

Medicine definition is - a substance or preparation used in treating disease

#### They don’t

#### A WTO waiver covers non-medicine tech
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Andrei Iancu, partner at Irell & Manella and former Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), kicked off the discussion. He explained that the waiver is extraordinarily broad, not only requesting a waiver of patents related to the COVID-19 vaccine technology, but all technologies that impact the treatment and care of COVID-19 related illnesses, including vaccines, respirators, software related to contact tracing, etc. Furthermore, even though the waiver seems on its face to be a temporary solution, it could have permanent consequences. He explained that the danger first lies in the revised language, which states that the waiver shall last for a minimum of three years, after which the waiver can be ended by agreement by the WTO. This is problematic, said Iancu, because in order for any change to be made at the WTO, all 164 member countries must unanimously agree. It is conceivable that at least one country would disagree, and thus the revised proposal effectively would make the waiver permanent.

#### Drop them for extra-topicality – a waiver justifies fiat abuse allowing affs to generate offense off of non-topical positions

#### [WAIVER ≠ IP REDUCTION CARD!!!]

#### Vote neg:

#### 1 – Semantics – controls the internal link to any pragmatic offense and determines what we research in the first place – without grounding in the topic there’s no way to debate the aff – independent voter for jurisdiction since judges can’t vote on an aff not defending the rez.

#### 2 – Ground – The aff’s interp destroys neg ground by forcing the neg to defend fringe patents on software unrelated to the core of the topic; kills pre-round prep and research