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#### Our interpretation is that the resolution should determine the division of affirmative and negative ground.

Violation: they don’t – the member nations of the world trade organization ought to ban intellectual property protectiosn for medicines wasn’t in the 1ac

#### Resolved means a policy

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### Medicines prevent, diagnose, or treat diseases and injuries

Maine Revenue Service 20 (MAINE REVENUE SERVICE SALES, FUEL & SPECIAL TAX DIVISION) “A REFERENCE GUIDE TO THE SALES AND USE TAX LAW” https://www.maine.gov/revenue/sites/maine.gov.revenue/files/inline-files/Reference%20Guide%202020.pdf December 2020 EE

“Medicines” means antibiotics, analgesics, antipyretics, stimulants, sedatives, antitoxins, anesthetics, antipruritics, hormones, antihistamines, certain “dermal fillers” (such as BoTox®), injectable contrast agents, vitamins, oxygen, vaccines and other substances that are used in the prevention, diagnosis or treatment of disease or injury and that either (1) require a prescription in order to be purchased or administered to the retail consumer or patient; or (2) are sold in packaging that contains a U.S. Food and Drug Administration OTC Drug Facts Label. “Sold on a doctor's prescription” means that a medical professional authorized by law to prescribe medicines for human beings dispensed or administered the medicine or a licensed pharmacist sold the medicine in accordance with a prescription issued by a medical professional authorized by law to prescribe medicines for human beings.

#### The NC is not a medicine, you can’t patent it and still be topical – since I’m the one who made it I’ll defend that the nc is just a speech and soemthing that isn’t used in prevention, diagnosis, or treatment of disease or injury

Vote neg -

#### 1] Limits: if you don’t have to be topical there’s an infinite amount of aff syou can make which guts my ability to prep and respond to them and forces me into generics –

#### 2] TVA Solves – just read your aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff. We aren’t stopping them from reading new FWs, mechanisms, or advantages. PICs don’t solve – it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff making it impossible for me to win – run the aff as a cap advantage to why monopolies are bad, or a baudrillard aff that says that medicines are symbols and patenting is impossible

3] Not universalizable – if nobody had to debate the chosen topic then there’d be no reason to have a topic in the first place which creates a contradiction.

#### Three impacts -

#### 1) fairness – debate is fundamentally a game which requires both sides to have a relatively equal shot at winning and is necessary for any benefit to the activity. That outweighs:

#### 2] decision-making: every argument concedes to the validity of fairness i.e. that the judge will make a fair decision based on the arguments presented. This means if they win fairness bad vote neg on presumption because you have no obligation to fairly evaluate their arguments.

Dtd -

#### Dropping the debater discourages them from engaging in unfair practices in the future and sets a positive norm. Deterrence and norming outweigh – A] scope – their model would cause multiple violations of the interp for strategic purposes which increases abuse in the long term, B] probability – norms like disclosing and a prioris bad have been set over years which proves deterrence is real

No rvis

#### 1] Skews neg strat since the 2AR can collapse for a persuasive 3min and I can never predict what they’ll say to preempt it

#### 2] Illogical – you shouldn’t win just cause you’re fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance

Comes before the k – we can’t discuss captialist structure if I’m contstarined by the way you discuss it which kilsl lit

Ci –

#### 1] Arbitrary – reasonability invites judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter – people set brightlines that allow them to get away with abuse.

#### 2] Collapses – reasonability collapses to competing interps – you justify two brightlines in an offense defense manner like two interps

# NC

#### The metaethic is practical reason. Prefer:

#### First, inescapability – the exercise of practical rationality requires that one regards it as intrinsically good – that justifies a right to freedom.

Wood [Allen W. Wood, (Stanford University, California) "Kantian Ethics" Cambridge University Press, 2007, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/kantian-ethics/769B8CD9FCC74DB6870189AE1645FAC8, DOA:8-12-2020 // WWBW]//rct st

Kant holds that the most basic act through which people exercise their practical rationality is that of setting an end (G 4:437). To set an end is, analytically, to subject yourself to the hypothetical imperative that you should take the necessary means to the end you have set (G 4:417). This is the claim that you rationally ought to do something whether or not you are at the moment inclined to do it. It represents the action of applying that means as good (G 4:414) – in the sense of “good” that Kant explicates as: what is required by reason independently of inclination (G 4:413). Kant correctly infers that any being which sets itself ends is committed to regarding its end as good in this sense, and also to regarding the goodness of its end as what also makes application of the means good – that is, rationally required independently of any inclination to apply it. The act of setting an end, therefore, must be taken as committing you to represent some other act (the act of applying the means) as good. In doing all this, however, the rational being must also necessarily regard its own rational capacities as authoritative for what is good in general. For it treats these capacities as capable of determining which ends are good, and at the same time as grounding the goodness of the means taken toward those good ends. But to regard one’s capacities in this way is also to take a certain attitude toward oneself as the being that has and exercises those capacities. It is to esteem oneself – and also to esteem the correct exercise of one’s rational capacities in determining what is good both as an end and as a means to it. One’s other capacities, such as those needed to perform the action that is good as a means, are also regarded as good as means. But that capacity through which we can represent the very idea of something as good both as end and as means is not represented merely as the object of a contingent inclination, nor is it represented as good only as a means. It must be esteemed as unconditionally good, as an end in itself. To find this value in oneself is not at all the same as thinking of oneself as a good person. Even those who misuse their rational capacities are committed to esteeming themselves as possessing rational nature. It also does not imply that a more intelligent person (in that sense, more “rational”) is “better” than a less intelligent one. The self-esteem involved in setting an end applies to any being capable of setting an end at all, irrespective of the cleverness or even the morality of the end setting. Kant’s argument supports the conclusion, to which he adheres with admirable consistency throughout his writings, that all rational beings, clever or stupid, even good or evil, have equal (absolute) worth as ends in themselves. For Kantian ethics the rational nature in every person is an end in itself whether the person is morally good or bad.

#### Second, value theory – the existence of extrinsic goodness requires unconditional human worth.

Korsgaard (Christine M., “Two Distinctions in Goodness,” The Philosophical Review Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 169-195, JSTOR) OS \*bracketed for gen lang\* //rct st

The argument shows how Kant's idea of justification works. It can be read as a kind of regress upon the conditions, starting from an important assumption. The assumption is that when a rational being makes a choice or undertakes an action, he or she [they] supposes the object to be good, and its pursuit to be justified. At least, if there is a categorical imperative there must be objectively good ends, for then there are necessary actions and so necessary ends (G 45-46/427-428 and Doctrine of Virtue 43-44/384-385). In order for there to be any objectively good ends, however, there must be something that is unconditionally good and so can serve as a sufficient condition of their goodness. Kant considers what this might be: it cannot be an object of inclination, for those have only a conditional worth, "for if the inclinations and the needs founded on them did not exist, their object would be without worth" (G 46/428). It cannot be the inclinations themselves because a rational being would rather be free from them. Nor can it be external things, which serve only as means. So, Kant asserts, the unconditionally valuable thing must be "humanity" or "rational nature," which he defines as "the power set to an end" (G 56/437 and DV 51/392). Kant explains that regarding your existence as a rational being as an end in itself is a "subjective principle of human action." By this I understand him to mean that we must regard ourselves as capable of conferring value upon the objects of our choice, the ends that we set, because we must regard our ends as good. But since "every other rational being thinks of his existence by the same rational ground which holds also for myself' (G 47/429), we must regard others as capable of conferring value by reason of their rational choices and so also as ends in themselves. Treating another as an end in itself thus involves making that person's ends as far as possible your own (G 49/430). The ends that are chosen by any rational being, possessed of the humanity or rational nature that is fully realized in a good will, take on the status of objective goods. They are not intrinsically valuable, but they are objectively valuable in the sense that every rational being has a reason to promote or realize them. For this reason it is our duty to promote the happiness of others-the ends that they choose-and, in general, to make the highest good our end.

#### Third, practical reason – ethical principles must be derived from the structure of reason:

#### [1] Regress – we can always ask why we should follow a theory, so they aren’t binding because they don’t have a starting point. Practical reason solves – When we ask why we should follow reason, we demand a reason, which concedes to the authority of reason itself, so it’s the only thing we can follow

#### [2] Action Theory – every action can be broken down to infinite amounts of movements, i.e. me moving my arm can be broken down to the infinite moments of every state my arm is in. Only reason can unify these movements because we use practical reason to achieve our goals, means all actions collapse to reason

#### Fourth, epistemology – ethics must begin a priori, meaning they can’t be derived from our experience.

#### [1] Representations of space – we can only access our experiences if we can interpret the space around us, but that requires the a priori. Thinking of the absence of space is impossible – we can think of empty space but never the lack of space itself. Imagining space through a priori thoughts is the only way we can even begin to have a conception of interpreting experience; we need to be able to construct space through our minds.

#### [2] Separateness – if space is based on experience, it must be formed from objects separate to us outside of our reasoning abilities. But to represent objects as separate from us, we would already need to assume space exists in the first place to have a concept of “separateness,” so to represent space as something separate from us would be incoherent.

#### [3] Uncertainty – every person has different experiences so we can’t have a unified perspective on what is good if we each have different conceptions of it – even if we can roughly aggregate it’s not enough because there’ll always be a case when it fails so the framework o/w on probability.

#### Practical reason means we all have a unified perspective: What can be justified to me can be justified to everyone who is a practical reasoner. If I can conclude that 2+2 is 4, then I understand not only that I know 2+2 is 4, but that everyone around me can arrive at the same conclusion. These things are temporally consistent: I know that me adding two numbers now and taking that sum will not result in me adding the same two numbers in the future and getting a different sum. Our unified perspective does not change but rather stays consistent.

#### But, willing an action that violates the freedom of others is a contradiction: If I decide to kill someone, that action is not universalizable because that would justify other people killing me too. If I die, I cannot exercise my freedom to kill someone else. This is a contradiction: I both justify extending my freedom to kill others and limiting my own freedom.

#### Thus, the standard is respecting freedom.

#### Impact calc –

#### 1] Ethics are based on intent, but the state does not have intentions and cannot know the intentions of other agents. Instead, the state acts a procedural mechanism to punish those who violate rights claims. Those rights are derived from the structure of intent.

#### 2] The state does not have the authority to act to preempt future rights violations, because consequences of action are contingent and cannot be derived from the structure of the maxim on which one acts. Thus, the state does not have the jurisdiction to take them into account.

#### 3] There is an act-omission distinction –

#### [a] Infinite Regress – Ethics cannot hold agents accountable for an infinite number of untaken decisions, otherwise that would impair action because agents would simultaneously have an infinite number of obligations.

#### Negate –

**[1] Property rights – putting limits on the economic uses of intellectual property creates a contradiction – the concept of property is violated if you aren't allowed to control how you use it.**

Pozzo**,**6 (Riccardo Pozzo, Riccardo Pozzo is an Italian philosopher and historian of philosophy., 11-18-2006, accessed on 8-12-2021, Scielo, "IMMANUEL KANT ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY", [https://www.scielo.br/j/trans/a/rLfb3yPN3p4KPsYpxp8LQCp/?format=pdf&lang=en)\*brack](https://www.scielo.br/j/trans/a/rLfb3yPN3p4KPsYpxp8LQCp/?format=pdf&lang=en)*brack)eted for gen lang\*//st

The error consists in mistaking one of these rights for the other” (Kant, 1902, t.6, p.290). The corpus mysticum, the work considered as an immaterial good, remains property of the author on behalf of the original right of its creation. The corpus mechanicum consists of the exemplars of the book or of the work of art. It becomes the property of whoever has bought the material object in which the work has been reproduced or expressed. Seneca points out in De beneficiis (VII, 6) the difference between owning a thing and owning its use. He tells us that the bookseller Dorus had the habit of calling Cicero’s books his own, while there are people who claim books their own because they have written them and other people that do the same because they have bought them. Seneca concludes that the books can be correctly said to belong to both, for it is true they belong to both, but in a different way. The peculiarity of intellectual property consists thus first in being indeed a property, but property of an action; and second in being indeed inalienable, but also transferable in commission and license to a publisher. The bond the author has on [their] work confers [them] a moral right that is indeed a personal right. It is also a right to exploit economically [their] work in all possible ways, a right of economic use, which is a patrimonial right. Kant and Fichte argued that moral right and the right of economic use are strictly connected, and that the offense to one implies inevitably offense to the other. In eighteenth-century Germany, the free use came into discussion among the presuppositions of a democratic renewal of state and society. In his Supplement to the Consideration of Publishing and Its Rights, Reimarus asked writers “instead of writing for the aristocracy, to write for the tiers état of the reader’s world.” (Reimarus, 1791b, p.595). He saluted with enthusiasm the claim of disenfranchising from the monopoly of English publishers expressed in the American Act for the Encouragement of Learning of May 31, 1790. Kant, however, was firm in embracing intellectual property. Referring himself to Roman Law, he asked for its legislative formulation not only as patrimonial right, but also as a personal right. In Of the Illegitimity of Pirate Publishing, he considered the moral faculties related to intellectual property as an “inalienable right (ius personalissimum) always himself to speak through anyone else, the right, that is, that no one may deliver the same speech to the public other than in his (the author’s) name” (Kant, 1902, t.8, p.85). Fichte went farther in the Demonstration of the Illegitimity of Pirate Publishing. He saw intellectual property as a part of his metaphysical construction of intellectual activity, which was based on the principle that thoughts “are not transmitted hand to hand, they are not paid with shining cash, neither are they transmitted to us if we take home the book Trans/Form/Ação, São Paulo, 29(2): 11-18, 2006 13 that contains them and put it into our library.

Property is possible – 1] their cap turns are incohernet bc they need us to rely on our expeirneces, which weve proved failed 2] even if property is built using the help of others, ownership of material takes this out – if a researcher puts their research into the open, they are acknowledgeing that anyone can take it and use their research as part of their own, so claiming property is possible like how if I buy steel form you to make a sowrd, by paying you you transfer ownership of that steel to me

#### [2] Act-omission distinction – not giving someone is an omission, otherwise we would have infinite obligations to tell everyone everything – pharma companies can’t be held accountable for doing functionally nothing so the state has no obligation to enact rules on it.