### 1

#### 1] Interpretation – Affs must defend a reduction in intellectual property protections that protect the medicines.

#### Medicines are physical substances

American Heritage Dictionary of Medicine 18 The American Heritage Dictionary of Medicine 2018 by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company <https://www.yourdictionary.com/medicine> //Elmer

"A **substance**, **especially a drug**, **used to treat** the signs and symptoms of a **disease**, condition, or injury."

#### 2] Violation: Data exclusivity laws protect clinical trial data. They do not prohibit generic manufacturers from conducting their own trials to manufacture the medicine.

<https://www.bu.edu/gdp/2021/05/25/chart-of-the-week-how-data-exclusivity-laws-impact-drug-prices/> //sid

Data exclusivity is a form of intellectual property protection that applies specifically to data from pharmaceutical clinical trials. While innovator firms run their own clinical trials to gain marketing approval, generic manufacturers typically rely on the innovator’s clinical trials for the same approval. Data exclusivity rules keep generic firms from relying on that data for 5 to 12 years, depending on the specific law. Data exclusivity operates independently of patent protection and can block generic manufacturers from gaining marketing approval even if the patent has expired or the original pharmaceutical product does not qualify for patent protection. Although data exclusivity laws are matters of domestic legislation, the United States, the EU and others increasingly demand in their free trade agreement (FTA) negotiations that their trading partners protect clinical trial data in this way. Data exclusivity is just one of a host of “TRIPS-plus” treaty provisions designed to raise the overall level of intellectual property protection for innovator firms. Although the WTO’s Agreement on Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) does require Member states to protect clinical trial and other data from “unfair commercial use,” it does not require exclusivity rules that block the registration of generic products.

#### 3] The Standard is Limits – They explode the topic to include drug discovery techniques, etc. that eviscerate a stable locus of predictability. Limits is a sequencing question to Clash and in-depth Education since we’re only able to prepare if there’s stable core controversies.

#### 4] Paradigm Issues for theory–

#### Fairness and education are voters – its how judges evaluate rounds and why schools fund debate

#### DTD – it’s key to norm set and deter future abuse

#### Competing interps – Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation – it also collapses since brightlines operate on an offense-defense paradigm

#### No RVIs – A – Encourages theory baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly B – its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments

### 2

#### Interpretation: “intellectual property protections” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend WTO member nations reducing a subset of intellectual property protections.

#### The upward entailment test and adverb test determine the genericity of a bare plural

Leslie and Lerner 16 [Sarah-Jane Leslie, Ph.D., Princeton, 2007. Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. Served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University. Adam Lerner, PhD Philosophy, Postgraduate Research Associate, Princeton 2018. From 2018, Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow in the Center for Bioethics at New York University. Member of the [Princeton Social Neuroscience Lab](http://psnlab.princeton.edu/).] “Generic Generalizations.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. April 24, 2016. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/> TG

1. Generics and Logical Form

In English, generics can be expressed using a variety of syntactic forms: bare plurals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), indefinite singulars (e.g., “a tiger is striped”), and definite singulars (“the tiger is striped”). However, none of these syntactic forms is dedicated to expressing generic claims; each can also be used to express existential and/or specific claims. Further, some generics express what appear to be generalizations over individuals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), while others appear to predicate properties directly of the kind (e.g., “dodos are extinct”). These facts and others give rise to a number of questions concerning the logical forms of generic statements.

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), some individual tiger in ([2b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex2b)), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in ([3b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex3b))—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.

The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with “some” with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology “existential reading”. The application of the term “existential interpretation” is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a kind.

There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, “tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) does not entail that animals are striped, but ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.)

#### It applies to “medicines” – 1] upward entailment test – “reduce intellectual property protections for medicines” doesn’t entail reducing protections for exclusivities, because it doesn’t prove that we should derestrict other beneficial tech, 2] adverb test – member nations “ought to usually reduce intellectual property protections for medicines” doesn’t substantially change resolutional meaning

#### **Violation – they only defend data exclusivities**

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits – you can pick anything from patents to evergreening to random delay and there’s no universal disad since each one has a different function and implication for health, tech, and relations – explodes neg prep and leads to random medicine of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible. PICs don’t solve – it’s absurd to say neg potential abuse justifies the aff being flat out not T, which leads to a race towards abuse. Limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep. TRIPS regulation doesn’t check bc the aff isn’t one of the 4 defined.

#### 2] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff.

c/a paradigm issues

### 3

#### Reconciliation passes now – the delay gives Biden time to work magic in the wings, but PC and focus are key

Herb et al. 10-1 (Jeremy Herb, CNN Politics Reporter, Kevin Liptak, Reporter, Phil Mattingly, Senior White House Correspondent, Lauren Fox, CNN Congressional Correspondent, Melanie Zanona, Capitol Hill Reporter, “'It doesn't matter when': How Biden gave feuding House Democrats an off-ramp”, CNN Politics, 10-1-21, <https://www.cnn.com/2021/10/01/politics/dems-biden-infrastructure-delay/index.html)//babcii>

(CNN)President Joe Biden didn't [travel to Capitol Hill on Friday](https://www.cnn.com/2021/10/01/politics/house-vote-infrastructure-democrats/index.html) to close the deal, or to rally the troops through a final legislative gantlet. There was nothing cinematic -- or dramatic -- about the trip down Pennsylvania Avenue for the 36-year Senate veteran, who has more than once informed aides of [his unparalleled ability](http://www.cnn.com/2021/09/27/politics/biden-agenda-congress-deal-maker/index.html) to read, speak to and corral lawmakers. Instead, in remarks that lasted less than 30 minutes, Biden served a singular purpose: a presidential pressure relief valve. In a week deemed an "inflection point" by top aides, where the President was rarely seen in public as his entire domestic agenda hung in the balance, it marked a seemingly low bar to clear for success. There would be no miraculous deal to unlock the formula to move forward on the two key components Democrats are attempting to pass. The promised vote on the [$1.2 trillion infrastructure bill](https://www.cnn.com/politics/live-news/congress-infrastructure-bill-vote-10-01-21/index.html) would not materialize. But after days of intraparty warfare and feverish late-night negotiations, a reset was desperately needed -- and the best Biden could offer. In delivering an unscripted and at times unwieldy message that the infrastructure vote wasn't likely to happen -- and the top-line cost of the economic and climate package was going to have to come down -- the President made the bet that he can keep both sides of the intraparty feud on board in the critical days and weeks to follow. **White House and Democratic leaders will now launch an all-out effort to win** over the two Senate Democratic holdouts, Sens. [Joe Manchin of West Virginia](https://www.cnn.com/2021/09/30/politics/joe-manchin-budget-bill-1-5-trillion-schumer/index.html) and [Kyrsten Sinema of Arizona](https://www.cnn.com/2021/09/30/politics/kyrsten-sinema-arizona-reaction/index.html), as they shape what the multitrillion-dollar economic and social package looks like -- and how high its price tag will be. Congressional Democrats and White House officials say progress was made this week getting all sides closer to an agreement on the massive economic, climate and health care spending package that Democratic leaders intend to pair with the bipartisan $1.2 trillion infrastructure bill that's passed the Senate already. But in the House, moderate and progressive Democrats were engaged in a **slow-motion game of chicken** over the infrastructure vote, with moderates demanding a vote on the infrastructure bill this week that had been pledged by House Speaker Nancy Pelosi -- and [progressives standing firm that they would vote it down](https://www.cnn.com/2021/09/30/politics/house-infrastructure-negotiations-vote/index.html) without an agreement on the framework for the larger economic package. On Friday, Biden sought the off-ramp. It marked his most direct effort to date to cajole the House Democratic caucus at a moment when its members have grown increasingly frustrated about the amount of attention the President and his team have paid to their side of the Capitol. Though well received with several ovations, the appearance didn't serve to salve those wounds entirely -- with some saying afterward that his pep talk had actually exacerbated them. But it did deliver a critical message and a consequential moment, multiple members said: Compromise now -- or end up with nothing. It's likely too soon to say whether the debate this week is just a preamble to Democrats' enacting their historic agenda or if it's a feud that leads to legislative defeat, hobbling the President's party ahead of a tough midterm election cycle with little to show for controlling both chambers of Congress and the White House. 'Who knows what label I get' After the roughly half hour meeting with the President, Democrats described a leader who was in his element and not working to change minds as much as remind members of their shared and unified goals as a caucus. Throughout the infrastructure push, Biden has made clear to Democrats that party unity -- or, in some participants' interpretation, loyalty -- is of utmost importance with only the slimmest of majorities in the House and Senate. He tried to break down the stalemate and the tensions that have hung over the party for weeks, reminding them that he's not on one side or the other. At one point, he made a reference to his own political ideology, saying, "Who knows what label I get." To which Pelosi replied: "President," prompting loud laughter from the room. Biden also talked about how he had redone his office to have paintings hung of Lincoln and FDR -- "A deeply divided country and the biggest economic transformation," said Rep. David Cicilline of Rhode Island, "which is kind of the moment we're in." White House officials think the President accomplished what he went to do on Capitol Hill: Remind Democrats of what is at stake while relieving some of the pressure that had built up over the last several days and reiterating his commitment to passing both pieces of legislation. With that done, officials believe, negotiators have a better environment to be able to push toward a deal. "We're going to get this done," Biden told reporters as he left the meeting. "It doesn't matter when. It doesn't, whether it's in six minutes, six days or six weeks -- we're going to get it done." 'As long as we're still alive' Even before Friday, Biden had alluded in recent days to negotiations slipping beyond the week's end. With the stakes simply too high -- on both the political and policy fronts -- there are no plans to walk away. "It may not be by the end of the week," the President had responded when asked Monday how he would define success at the end of this week. "I hope it's by the end of the week." "But as long as we're still alive ...," Biden said before shifting course in his thought.

#### Attacks on Pharmaceutical Profits triggers Mod Dem Backlash – it disrupts unity.

Cohen 9-6 Joshua Cohen 9-6-2021 "Democrats’ Plans To Introduce Prescription Drug Pricing Reform Face Formidable Obstacles" <https://www.forbes.com/sites/joshuacohen/2021/09/06/democrats-plans-to-introduce-prescription-drug-pricing-reform-face-obstacles/?sh=37a269917395> (independent healthcare analyst with over 22 years of experience analyzing healthcare and pharmaceuticals.)//Elmer

There’s considerable uncertainty regarding passage with a simple majority of the 2021 massive budget reconciliation bill. Last week, Senator Joe Manchin called on Democrats to pause pushing forward the budget reconciliation bill. If Manchin winds up saying no to the bill, this would scuttle it as the Democrats can’t afford to lose a single Senator. And, there’s speculation that provisions to reduce prescription drug prices may be watered down and not incorporate international price referencing. Additionally, reduced prices derived through Medicare negotiation may not be able to be applied to those with employer-based coverage. While the progressive wing of the Democratic Party supports drug pricing reform, **several key centrist Democrats** in both the House and Senate appear to be **uncomfortable** **with** particular aspects of the budget reconciliation bill, including a potential deal-breaker, namely the potential **negative impact of drug price controls on the domestic pharmaceutical industry**, as well as long-term patient access to new drugs. A paper released in 2019 by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found that the proposed legislation, H.R. 3, would reduce global revenue for new drugs by 19%, leading to 8 fewer drugs approved in the U.S. between 2020 and 2029, and 30 fewer drugs over the next decade. And, a new report from the CBO reinforces the message that drug pricing legislation under consideration in Congress could lead to fewer new drugs being developed and launched. **Intense lobbying efforts from biopharmaceutical industry groups** **are underway**, **warning of** what they deem are **harms from price controls in** the form of diminished patient **access to new innovations**. The argument, based in part on assumptions and modeling included in the CBO reports, asserts that price controls would dampen investment critical to the biopharmaceutical industry’s pipeline of drugs and biologics. **This** won’t sway most Democrats, but has been a traditional talking point in the Republican Party for decades, and **may convince some centrist Democrats to withdraw backing** of provisions **that** in their eyes **stymie pharmaceutical innovation.** If the budget reconciliation bill would fail to garner a majority, a pared down version of H.R. 3, or perhaps a new bill altogether, with Senator Wyden spearheading the effort, could eventually land in the Senate. But, a similar set of provisos would apply, as majority support in both chambers would be far from a sure thing. In brief, Democrats’ plans at both the executive and legislative branch levels to introduce prescription **drug pricing reform** **encounter challenges** which may prevent impactful modifications from taking place.

#### Sinema specifically jumps Ship.

Hancock and Lucas 20 Jay Hancock and Elizabeth Lucas 5-29-2020 "A Senator From Arizona Emerges As A Pharma Favorite" <https://khn.org/news/a-senator-from-arizona-emerges-as-a-pharma-favorite/> (Senior Correspondent, joined KHN in 2012 from The Baltimore Sun, where he wrote a column on business and finance. Previously he covered the State Department and the economics beat for The Sun and health care for The Virginian-Pilot of Norfolk and the Daily Press of Newport News. He has a bachelor’s degree from Colgate University and a master’s in journalism from Northwestern University.)//Elmer

Sen. Kyrsten **Sinema formed** a **congressional caucus to raise** “**awareness of the benefits of personalized medicine**” in February. Soon after that, employees of **pharmaceutical companies** **donated** $35,000 to her campaign committee. Amgen gave $5,000. So did Genentech and Merck. Sanofi, Pfizer and Eli Lilly all gave $2,500. Each of those companies has invested heavily in personalized medicine, which promises individually tailored drugs that can cost a patient hundreds of thousands of dollars. **Sinema** is a first-term Democrat from Arizona but has nonetheless **emerged as a pharma favorite in Congress** as the industry steers through a new political and economic landscape formed by the coronavirus. She is a **leading recipient of pharma campaign cash** even though she’s not up for reelection until 2024 and lacks major committee or subcommittee leadership posts. For the 2019-20 election cycle through March, political action committees run by employees of drug companies and their trade groups gave her $98,500 in campaign funds, Kaiser Health News’ Pharma Cash to Congress database shows. That stands out in a Congress in which a third of the members got no pharma cash for the period and half of those who did got $10,000 or less. The contributions give companies a chance to cultivate Sinema as she restocks from a brutal 2018 election victory that cost nearly $25 million. Altogether, pharma PACs have so far given $9.2 million to congressional campaign chests in this cycle, compared with $9.4 million at this point in the 2017-18 period, a sustained surge as the industry has responded to complaints about soaring prices. Sinema’s pharma haul was twice that of Sen. Susan Collins of Maine, considered one of the most vulnerable Republicans in November, and approached that of fellow Democrat Steny Hoyer, the powerful House majority leader from Maryland. It all adds up to **a bet by drug companies that** the 43-year-old **Sinema**, first elected to the Senate in 2018, **will** gain influence in coming years and **serve as an industry ally** in a party that also includes many lawmakers harshly critical of high drug prices and the companies that set them.

#### Infrastructure reform solves Existential Climate Change – it results in spill-over.

USA Today 7-20 7-20-2021 "Climate change is at 'code red' status for the planet, and inaction is no longer an option" <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/todaysdebate/2021/07/20/climate-change-biden-infrastructure-bill-good-start/7877118002/> //Elmer

**Not long ago**, **climate change** for many Americans **was** like **a distant bell**. News of starving polar bears or melting glaciers was tragic and disturbing, but other worldly. Not any more. **Top climate scientists** from around the world **warned of a "code red for humanity**" in a report issued Monday that says severe, human-caused global warming is become unassailable. Proof of the findings by the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is a now a factor of daily life. Due to **intense heat waves and drought**, 107 wildfires – including the largest ever in California – are now raging across the West, consuming 2.3 million acres. Earlier this summer, hundreds of people died in unprecedented triple-digit heat in Oregon, Washington and western Canada, when a "heat dome" of enormous proportions settled over the region for days. Some victims brought by stretcher into crowded hospital wards had body temperatures so high, their nervous systems had shut down. People collapsed trying to make their way to cooling shelters. Heat-trapping greenhouse gases Scientists say the event was almost **certainly made worse and more intransigent by human-caused climate change**. They attribute it to a combination of warming Arctic temperatures and a growing accumulation of heat-trapping greenhouse gases caused by the burning of fossil fuels. The **consequences of** what mankind has done to the atmo**sphere are now inescapable**. Periods of **extreme heat** are projected to **double** in the lower 48 states by 2100. **Heat deaths** are far **outpacing every other form of weather killer** in a 30-year average. A **persistent megadrought** in America's West continues to create tinder-dry conditions that augur another devastating wildfire season. And scientists say **warming oceans** are **fueling** ever **more powerful storms**, evidenced by Elsa and the early arrival of hurricane season this year. Increasingly severe weather is causing an estimated $100 billion in damage to the United States every year. "It is honestly surreal to see your projections manifesting themselves in real time, with all the suffering that accompanies them. It is heartbreaking," said climate scientist Katharine Hayhoe. **Rising seas** from global warming Investigators are still trying to determine what led to the collapse of a Miami-area condominium that left more than 100 dead or missing. But one concerning factor is the corrosive effect on reinforced steel structures of encroaching saltwater, made worse in Florida by a foot of rising seas from global warming since the 1900s. The clock is ticking for planet Earth. While the U.N. report concludes some level of severe climate change is now unavoidable, there is still a window of time when far more catastrophic events can be mitigated. But mankind must act soon to curb the release of heat-trapping gases. Global **temperature** has **risen** nearly **2 degrees** Fahrenheit since the pre-industrial era of the late 19th century. Scientists warn that in a decade, it could surpass a **2.7**-degree increase. That's **enough** warming **to cause catastrophic climate changes**. After a brief decline in global greenhouse gas emissions during the pandemic, pollution is on the rise. Years that could have been devoted to addressing the crisis were wasted during a feckless period of inaction by the Trump administration. Congress must act Joe Biden won the presidency promising broad new policies to cut America's greenhouse gas emissions. But Congress needs to act on those ideas this year. Democrats cannot risk losing narrow control of one or both chambers of Congress in the 2022 elections to a Republican Party too long resistant to meaningful action on the climate. So what's at issue? A trillion dollar **infrastructure bill** negotiated between Biden and a group of centrist senators (including 10 Republicans) is a start. In addition to repairing bridges, roads and rails, it would **improve access** by the nation's power infrastructure **to renewable energy sources,** **cap millions of abandoned oil and gas wells spewing greenhouse gases**, **and harden structures against climate change**. It also **offers tax credits for** the **purchase of electric vehicles** and funds the construction of charging stations. (**The nation's largest source of climate pollution are gas-powered vehicles**.) Senate approval could come very soon. Much **more is needed** if the nation is going to reach Biden's necessary goal of cutting U.S. climate pollution in half from 2005 levels by 2030. His ideas worth considering include a federal clean electricity standard for utilities, federal investments and tax credits to promote renewable energy, and tens of billions of dollars in clean energy research and development, including into ways of extracting greenhouse gases from the skies. Another idea worth considering is a fully refundable carbon tax. **The vehicle** for these additional proposals **would be a second infrastructure bill**. And if Republicans balk at the cost of such vital investment, Biden is rightly proposing to pass this package through a process known as budget reconciliation, which allows bills to clear the Senate with a simple majority vote. These are drastic legislative steps. But drastic times call for them. And when Biden attends a U.N. climate conference in November, he can use American progress on climate change as a mean of persuading others to follow our lead. Further delay is not an option.

### 4

#### A. Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than [The member nations of the world trade organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines] then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)*

#### B. Violation:

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair –

#### a) Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides.

#### b) Shiftiness-Having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things.

#### 2. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Having one also encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.

c/a paradigm issues

### 5

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, 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: maintain as true.

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

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### Negate because either the aff is true meaning its bad for us to clash w/ it because it turns us into Fake News people OR it’s not meaning it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### a priori's 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true so it's constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

#### Negate –

#### 1] of[[3]](#footnote-3) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 2] the[[4]](#footnote-4) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

#### 3] reduce[[5]](#footnote-5) is to “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.

#### 4] medicine[[6]](#footnote-6) is “(especially among some North American Indian peoples) a spell, charm, or fetish believed to have healing, protective, or other power” but you can’t have IP for a spell.

#### 6] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to the aff which means it’s impossible to have complete tolerance for ideas

#### 7] Decision Making Paradox- in order to decide to do the affirmative we need a decision-making procedure to enact it but to choose a decision-making procedure requires another decision making procedure leading to infinite regress.

### 6

#### The standard is consistency with the logical consequence of the resolution. Prefer this –

#### 1. Text – Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought> //Massa

#### Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### 2. Debatability – a) my interp means debates focus on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years b) Moral oughts cannot guide action due to the is/ought fallacy – we cannot derive moral obligations from what happens in the real world

#### 3. Neg definition choice – Anything else kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

#### Their inherency proves the aff won’t happen. Either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) It is and it isn’t going to happen.

### 7

#### Interpretation: Debaters may only read one independent framework justification. To clarify, your framework can contain at most a syllogism that leads to your framework’s conclusion and one independent reason to prefer that is not dependent on the syllogism.

#### Violation: There are multiple independent reasons to prefer the util framework [e.g. actor spec, TJFs, reductionism].

#### 1] Strat Skew & Clash- Each of these arguments is functionally a NIB on the framework because if I drop even one of these, it’s game over. Reading one solves since it ensures aff framework flexibility while also ensuring legitimate clash. That outweighs on probability because util frameworks spam 15 blippy framework justifications and always go for one that doesn’t get responded to because of time.

#### 2] Judge Intervention- Most of the warrants in the aff do not prove utilitarianism. They either prove a consequentialist theory, a hedonistic/egoist theory, or even negative consequentialism. That means Judges use their prior knowledge to fill in the gaps for the util framework rather than letting the aff syllogistically justify it. That outweighs on probability – it happens in every round in the west coast where debaters don’t even have syllogisms or just collapse to ASpec.

### Case

#### Plan flaw- the word “IP” in their plan text means Internet Protocol, means their aff is incoherent so vote neg. It’s the first thing that comes up if you look up “IP” on google.

#### Alt Causes to lack of generics thump Aff solvency to zero – pay-for-delay, citizen petitions, authorized generics, and testing sample access – this is terminal since they’d just shift tactics to non-patent strategies.

Fox 17, Erin. "How pharma companies game the system to keep drugs expensive." Harvard Business Review (April 6, 2017), https://hbr. org/2017/04/how-pharma-companies-game-the-system-to-keep-drugs-expensive (last visited on November 22, 2019) (2017). (director of Drug Information at University of Utah Health)//Elmer

The ways companies stop generics One of the ways branded drug manufacturers prevent competition is simple: cash. In so-called “pay for delay” agreements, a brand drug company simply pays a generic company not to launch a version of a drug. The Federal Trade Commission estimates these pacts cost U.S. consumers and taxpayers $3.5 billion in higher drug costs each year. “Citizen petitions” offer drug companies another way to delay generics from being approved. These ask the Food and Drug Administration to delay action on a pending generic drug application. By law, the FDA is required to prioritize these petitions. However, the citizens filing concerns are not individuals, they’re corporations. The FDA recently said branded drug manufacturers submitted 92% of all citizen petitions. Many of these petitions are filed near the date of patent expiration, effectively limiting potential competition for another 150 days. “Authorized generics” are another tactic to limit competition. These aren’t really generic products at all; they are the same product sold under a generic name by the company that sells the branded drug. Why? By law, the first generic company to market a drug gets an exclusivity period of 180 days. During this time, no other companies can market a generic product. But the company with the expiring patent is not barred from launching an “authorized generic.” By selling a drug they’re already making under a different name, pharmaceutical firms are effectively extending their monopoly for another six months. Another way pharmaceutical firms are thwarting generics is by restricting access to samples for testing. Generic drug makers need to be able to purchase a sample of a brand-name product to conduct bioequivalence testing. That’s because they have to prove they can make a bioequivalent product following the current good manufacturing practices (CGMP) standard. These manufacturers don’t need to conduct clinical trials like the original drug company did. But the original drug developer often declines to sell drug samples to generics manufacturers by citing “FDA requirements,” by which they mean the agency’s Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies program. The idea behind this program is a good one: give access to patients who will benefit from these personalized medicines, and bar access for patients who won’t benefit and could be seriously harmed. However, brand drug makers are citing these requirements for the sole purpose of keeping generics from coming to market.

#### Petitions to the FDA swamp and deter generics.

Feldman 17 Robin Feldman 6-16-2017 "Pharma companies fight behind-the-scenes wars over generic drugs" <https://www.statnews.com/2017/06/16/generic-drugs-biosimilars-pharma/> (Arthur J. Goldberg Distinguished Professor of Law and Director of the Center for Innovation.)//Elmer

One tactic that my colleague Evan Frondorf and I describe in our book, “Drug Wars: How Big Pharma Raises Prices and Keeps Generics Off the Market,” involves petitions to the Food and Drug Administration asking that the agency not give the green light to generic versions of a drug. Our research on 12 years of FDA data shows that in some years nearly 1 out of every 5 petitions filed on any topic — including food, tobacco, dietary supplements, and devices — was related to delaying generic entry. The FDA denies 80 percent of these petitions, but the process takes time, even for silly petitions, such as one asking the FDA to declare that a generic must provide information that the regulations already require. The time it takes to respond to these petitions delays the entry of the generic.

#### Authorized Generics decimate competition.

Sipkoff 4 Martin Sipkoff 8-4-2004 "Big Pharma uses effective strategies to battle generic competitors" <https://www.drugtopics.com/view/big-pharma-uses-effective-strategies-battle-generic-competitors> (Healthcare Writer)//Elmer

But, according to Cutting Edge, brand-name pharmaceutical companies have begun flanking generics in an inventive way: They enter into manufacturing and distribution agreements with a generic company before a patent is about to expire, attempting to preempt market share. "A typical agreement specifies that the generic company will serve as a distributor of the nonbranded, generic form of the drug, which will continue to be produced in the branded drug company's manufacturing facilities," said Hess. "It's an increasingly popular strategy, often stemming from out-of-court patent lawsuit settlements." A successful flanking strategy can be beneficial to a generic manufacturer because it saves on capital outlay by not having to build or modify manufacturing facilities. "The brand-name pharmaceutical company benefits because the partnership enables it to continue to operate its manufacturing lines and turn a profit, thereby recouping more of its R&D investment in the drug and more of its capital investment in the manufacturing plant," said Hess. Here's an example of effective flanking: Generic drugmaker Apotex launched a version of GlaxoSmithKline's blockbuster drug Paxil in September 2003, threatening to significantly dent GSK's $3.2 billion-a-year bestseller. In response to Apotex's entry into the market, GSK struck a licensing agreement with another generic drugmaker, Par Pharmaceutical, in April 2003. The agreement specifies that GSK will supply Par with generic Paxil, in immediate-release form. The tablets are made by a GSK subsidiary, and Parwhich pays a royalty to GSK on salesdistributes them in the United States. "The royalty payments help GSK capture a small segment of the generic Paxil market, which offsets the losses of its branded Paxil sales following the drug's patent expiration," said Hess. Flanking is very controversial because it virtually derails competition. In fact, some generic manufacturers say it's illegal. It's very similar to what the Generic Pharmaceutical Association and others regard as the illegitimate strategy of "authorized generics." "It's an easy concept to describe," said Robert Reznick, a partner with the national law firm Hughes Hubbard & Reed. He chairs the firm's Pharmaceutical and Healthcare Practice Group and has written about the legality of authorized generics. "An authorized generic is like any other generic in that it is deemed equivalent to a brand-name drug," he said. "But rather than being made by an independent generic drug manufacturer pursuant to an Abbreviated New Drug Application, it is either made by or under a license from the New Drug Application holder itself. It may be marketed by an affiliate of the brand-name manufacturer or by a third party." In a white paper titled "Are Authorized Generics Lawful?" Reznick and his colleagues recently concluded that agreements between brand and generic manufacturers to create authorized generics may be legal under antitrust law, but the issue has yet to be fully settled.

#### Generic companies are just incompetent – means even without patents, they wouldn’t be able to produce.

Fox 17, Erin. "How pharma companies game the system to keep drugs expensive." Harvard Business Review (April 6, 2017), https://hbr. org/2017/04/how-pharma-companies-game-the-system-to-keep-drugs-expensive (last visited on November 22, 2019) (2017). (director of Drug Information at University of Utah Health)//Elmer

Problems with generic drug makers Although makers of a branded drug are using a variety of tactics to create barriers to healthy competition, generic drug companies are often not helping their own case. In 2015, there were 267 recalls of generic drug products—more than one every other day. These recalls are for quality issues such as products not dissolving properly, becoming contaminated, or even being outright counterfeits. A few high-profile recalls have shaken the belief that generic drugs are truly the same. In 2014, the FDA withdrew approval of Budeprion XL 300 — Teva’s generic version of GlaxoSmithKline’s Wellbutrin XL. Testing showed the drug did not properly release its key ingredient, substantiating consumers’ claims that the generic was not equivalent. In addition, concerns about contaminated generic Lipitor caused the FDA to launch a $20 million initiative to test generic products to ensure they are truly therapeutically equivalent. In some cases, patent law also collides with the FDA’s manufacturing rules. For example, the Novartis patent for Diovan expired in 2012. Ranbaxy received exclusivity for 180 days for the first generic product. However, due to poor quality manufacturing, Ranbaxy couldn’t obtain final FDA approval for its generic version. The FDA banned shipments of Ranbaxy products to the United States. Ranbaxy ended up paying a $500 million fine, the largest penalty paid by a generic firm for violations. Due to these protracted problems with the company that had won exclusivity, a generic product did not become available until 2014. The two-year delay cost Medicare and Medicaid at least $900 million. Ranbaxy’s poor-quality manufacturing also delayed other key generic products like Valcyte and Nexium. Ironically, it was Mylan—involved in its own drug pricing scandal over its EpiPen allergy-reaction injector—that filed the first lawsuit to have the FDA strip Ranbaxy of its exclusivity. Mylan made multiple attempts to produce generic products but was overruled in the courts.

#### No extinction from pandemics

* Death rates as high as 50% didn’t collapse civilization
* Fossil fuel record caps risk at .1% per century
* health, sanitation, medicine, science, public health bodies, solve
* viruses can’t survive in all locations
* refugee populations like tribes, remote researchers, submarine crews, solve

Ord 20 Ord, Toby. Toby David Godfrey Ord (born 18 July 1979) is an Australian philosopher. He founded Giving What We Can, an international society whose members pledge to donate at least 10% of their income to effective charities and is a key figure in the effective altruism movement, which promotes using reason and evidence to help the lives of others as much as possible.[3] He is a Senior Research Fellow at the University of Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, where his work is focused on existential risk. BA in Phil and Comp Sci from Melbourne, BPhil in Phil from Oxford, PhD in Phil from Oxford. The precipice: existential risk and the future of humanity. Hachette Books, 2020.

Are we safe now from events like this? Or are we more vulnerable? Could a pandemic threaten humanity’s future?10 The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In 541 CE the Plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine Empire. Over three years it took the lives of roughly 3 percent of the world’s people.11 When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of exchange, through diseases such as measles, influenza and especially smallpox. During the next hundred years a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll—one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the loss of more than 90 percent of the population of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower.12 And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. As a rough upper bound, the Columbian exchange may have killed as many as 10 percent of the world’s people.13 Centuries later, the world had become so interconnected that a truly global pandemic was possible. Near the end of the First World War, a devastating strain of influenza (known as the 1918 flu or Spanish Flu) spread to six continents, and even remote Pacific islands. At least a third of the world’s population were infected and 3 to 6 percent were killed.14 This death toll outstripped that of the First World War, and possibly both World Wars combined. Yet even events like these fall short of being a threat to humanity’s longterm potential.15 In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilization in the affected areas falter, but recover. The regional 25 to 50 percent death rate was not enough to precipitate a continent-wide collapse of civilization. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have altered the course of history substantially, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilization is likely to make it through future events with similar death rates, even if they were global in scale. The 1918 flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development despite its global reach. It looks like it was lost in the wake of the First World War, which despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history.16 It is less clear what lesson to draw from the Columbian exchange due to our lack of good records and its mix of causes. Pandemics were clearly a part of what led to a regional collapse of civilization, but we don’t know whether this would have occurred had it not been for the accompanying violence and imperial rule. The strongest case against existential risk from natural pandemics is the fossil record argument from Chapter 3. Extinction risk from natural causes above 0.1 percent per century is incompatible with the evidence of how long humanity and similar species have lasted. But this argument only works where the risk to humanity now is similar or lower than the longterm levels. For most risks this is clearly true, but not for pandemics. We have done many things to exacerbate the risk: some that could make pandemics more likely to occur, and some that could increase their damage. Thus even “natural” pandemics should be seen as a partly anthropogenic risk. Our population now is a thousand times greater than over most of human history, so there are vastly more opportunities for new human diseases to originate.17 And our farming practices have created vast numbers of animals living in unhealthy conditions within close proximity to humans. This increases the risk, as many major diseases originate in animals before crossing over to humans. Examples include HIV (chimpanzees), Ebola (bats), SARS (probably bats) and influenza (usually pigs or birds).18 Evidence suggests that diseases are crossing over into human populations from animals at an increasing rate.19 Modern civilization may also make it much easier for a pandemic to spread. The higher density of people living together in cities increases the number of people each of us may infect. Rapid long-distance transport greatly increases the distance pathogens can spread, reducing the degrees of separation between any two people. Moreover, we are no longer divided into isolated populations as we were for most of the last 10,000 years.20 Together these effects suggest that we might expect more new pandemics, for them to spread more quickly, and to reach a higher percentage of the world’s people. But we have also changed the world in ways that offer protection. We have a healthier population; improved sanitation and hygiene; preventative and curative medicine; and a scientific understanding of disease. Perhaps most importantly, we have public health bodies to facilitate global communication and coordination in the face of new outbreaks. We have seen the benefits of this protection through the dramatic decline of endemic infectious disease over the last century (though we can’t be sure pandemics will obey the same trend). Finally, we have spread to a range of locations and environments unprecedented for any mammalian species. This offers special protection from extinction events, because it requires the pathogen to be able to flourish in a vast range of environments and to reach exceptionally isolated populations such as uncontacted tribes, Antarctic researchers and nuclear submarine crews. 21 It is hard to know whether these combined effects have increased or decreased the existential risk from pandemics. This uncertainty is ultimately bad news: we were previously sitting on a powerful argument that the risk was tiny; now we are not. But note that we are not merely interested in the direction of the change, but also in the size of the change. If we take the fossil record as evidence that the risk was less than one in 2,000 per century, then to reach 1 percent per century the pandemic risk would need to be at least 20 times larger. This seems unlikely. In my view, the fossil record still provides a strong case against there being a high extinction risk from “natural” pandemics. So most of the remaining existential risk would come from the threat of permanent collapse: a pandemic severe enough to collapse civilization globally, combined with civilization turning out to be hard to re-establish or bad luck in our attempts to do so.
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