## 1

**The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing. Prefer:**

**1] Theory first –**

**A] Ground – both debaters have ground underneath util because every action has a consequence that can be weighed fairly using different metrics under the framing – other frameworks flow exclusively to one side.**

**B] Topic lit – most articles are written through a utilitarian lens because they are crafted for policymakers and the general public who believes consequences are important – key to fairness because topic lit is how we determine in-round engagement.**

**2] Use epistemic modesty to evaluate competing frameworks: that means multiply the probability the framework is true by the magnitude of the impact under a framework. Prefer:**

**A] Maximizes the probability of achieving net most moral value—beating a framework acts as mitigation to their impacts which means its substantively true.**

**B] Clash – disincentives debaters from going all in for framework which means we get the ideal balance between topic ed and phil ed—it’s important to talk about contention-level offense.**

**3] Actor specificity:**

**A] Aggregation – governments only have access to averages and aggregates which are the basis of justification for their policies**

**B] No intent-foresight distinction – If we foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen**

**C] Util is intrinsic to us we can’t avoid that maximizing well being is the most moral action**

**Nagel 86:** Thomas Nagel, The View From Nowhere, HUP, 1986: 156-168.

I shall defend the unsurprising claim that sensory pleasure is good and pain bad, no matter whose they are. The point of the exercise is to see how the pressures of objectification operate in a simple case. Physical pleasure and pain do not usually depend on activities or desires which themselves raise questions of justification and value. They are just sensory experiences in relation to which we are fairly passive, but toward which we feel involuntary desire or aversion. Almost Everyone takes the avoidance of his own pain and the promotion of his own pleasure as subjective reasons for action in a fairly simple way; they are not back up by any further reasons.

## 2

#### CP: Member nations of the World Trade Organization should enter into a prior and binding consultation with the World Health Organization over reducing intellectual property protections by implementing a one-and-done approach for patent protection. Member nations will support the proposal and adopt the results of consultation.

#### The WHO supports a positive agenda for policy action against TRIPS and for increasing the availability of generic drugs.

Hoen 03 [(Ellen T., researcher at the University Medical Centre at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands who has been listed as one of the 50 most influential people in intellectual property by the journal Managing Intellectual Property, PhD from the University of Groningen) “TRIPS, Pharmaceutical Patents and Access to Essential Medicines: Seattle, Doha and Beyond,” Chicago Journal of International Law, 2003] TJHSSTAP

However, subsequent resolutions of the World Health Assembly have strengthened the WHO’s mandate in the trade arena. In 2001, the World Health Assembly adopted two resolutions in particular that had a bearing on the debate over TRIPS [30]. The resolutions addressed: – the need to strengthen policies to increase the availability of generic drugs; – and the need to evaluate the impact of TRIPS on access to drugs, local manufacturing capacity, and the development of new drugs. As a result, the WHO’s work programme on pharmaceuticals and trade now includes the provision of policy guidance and information on intellectual property and health to countries for monitoring and analyzing the effects of TRIPS on access to medicines [31].

#### Consultation displays strong leadership, authority, and cohesion among member states which are key to WHO legitimacy

Gostin et al 15 [(Lawrence O., Linda D. & Timothy J. O’Neill Professor of Global Health Law at Georgetown University, Faculty Director of the O’Neill Institute for National & Global Health Law, Director of the World Health Organization Collaborating Center on Public Health Law & Human Rights, JD from Duke University) “The Normative Authority of the World Health Organization,” Georgetown University Law Center, 5/2/2015] JL

Members want the WHO to exert leadership, harmonize disparate activities, and set priorities. Yet they resist intrusions into their sovereignty, and want to exert control. In other words, ‘everyone desires coordination, but no one wants to be coordinated.’ States often ardently defend their geostrategic interests. As the Indonesian virus-sharing episode illustrates, the WHO is pulled between power blocs, with North America and Europe (the primary funders) on one side and emerging economies such as Brazil, China, and India on the other. An inherent tension exists between richer ‘net contributor’ states and poorer ‘net recipient’ states, with the former seeking smaller WHO budgets and the latter larger budgets.

Overall, national politics drive self-interest, with states resisting externally imposed obligations for funding and action. Some political leaders express antipathy to, even distrust of, UN institutions, viewing them as bureaucratic and inefficient. In this political environment, it is unsurprising that members fail to act as shareholders. Ebola placed into stark relief the failure of the international community to increase capacities as required by the IHR. Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone had some of the world's weakest health systems, with little capacity to either monitor or respond to the Ebola epidemic.20 This caused enormous suffering in West Africa and placed countries throughout the region e and the world e at risk. Member states should recognize that the health of their citizens depends on strengthening others' capacity. The WHO has a central role in creating systems to facilitate and encourage such cooperation.

The WHO cannot succeed unless members act as shareholders, foregoing a measure of sovereignty for the global common good. It is in all states' interests to have a strong global health leader, safeguarding health security, building health systems, and reducing health inequalities. But that will not happen unless members fund the Organization generously, grant it authority and flexibility, and hold it accountable.

#### WHO is critical to disease prevention – it is the only international institution that can disperse information, standardize global public health, and facilitate public-private cooperation

Murtugudde 20 [(Raghu, professor of atmospheric and oceanic science at the University of Maryland, PhD in mechanical engineering from Columbia University) “Why We Need the World Health Organization Now More Than Ever,” Science, 4/19/2020] TJHSSTAP

**WHO continues to play an indispensable role during the current COVID-19 outbreak itself**. In November 2018, the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine organised a workshop to explore lessons from past influenza outbreaks and so develop recommendations for pandemic preparedness for 2030. **The salient findings serve well to underscore the critical role of WHO for humankind.** The world’s influenza burden has only increased in the last two decades, a period in which there have also been 30 new zoonotic diseases. A warming world with increasing humidity, lost habitats and industrial livestock/poultry farming has many opportunities for pathogens to move from animals and birds to humans. **Increasing global connectivity simply catalyses this process, as much as it catalyses economic growth.** **WHO coordinates health research, clinical trials, drug safety, vaccine development, surveillance, virus sharing**, etc. The importance of WHO’s work on immunisation across the globe, especially with HIV, can hardly be overstated. **It has a rich track record of collaborating with private-sector organisations to advance research and development of health solutions** and improving their access in the global south. It discharges its duties **while** **maintaining a dynamic equilibrium between such diverse and powerful forces as national securities, economic interests, human rights and ethics**. COVID-19 has highlighted how political calculations can hamper data-sharing and mitigation efforts within and across national borders, and **WHO often** simply becomes a convenient political scapegoat in such situations. **International Health Regulations**, a 2005 agreement between 196 countries to work together for global health security, **focuses on detection, assessment and reporting of public health events**, and also includes non-pharmaceutical interventions such as travel and trade restrictions. **WHO coordinates and helps build capacity to implement IHR**.

#### WHO diplomacy solves great power conflict

Murphy 20 [(Chris, U.S. senator from Connecticut serving on the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee) “The Answer is to Empower, Not Attack, the World Health Organization,” War on the Rocks, 4/21/2020] JL

The World Health Organization is critical to stopping disease outbreaks and strengthening public health systems in developing countries, where COVID-19 is starting to appear. Yemen announced its first infection earlier this month, and other countries in Africa, Asia and the Middle East are at severe risk. Millions of refugees rely on the World Health Organization for their health care, and millions of children rely on the WHO and UNICEF to access vaccines.

The World Health Organization is not perfect, but its team of doctors and public health experts have had major successes. Their most impressive claim to fame is the eradication of smallpox – no small feat. More recently, the World Health Organization has led an effort to rid the world of two of the three strains of polio, and they are close to completing the trifecta.

These investments are not just the right thing to do; they benefit the United States. Improving health outcomes abroad provides greater political and economic stability, increasing demand for U.S. exports. And, as we are all learning now, it is in America’s national security interest for countries to effectively detect and respond to potential pandemics before they reach our shores.

As the United States looks to develop a new global system of pandemic prevention, there is absolutely no way to do that job without the World Health Organization. Uniquely, it puts traditional adversaries – like Russia and the United States, India and Pakistan, or Iran and Saudi Arabia – all around the same big table to take on global health challenges. It has relationships with the public health leaders of every nation, decades of experience in tackling viruses and diseases, and the ability to bring countries together to tackle big projects. This ability to bridge divides and work across borders cannot be torn down and recreated – not in today’s environment of major power competition – and so there is simply no way to build an effective international anti-pandemic infrastructure without the World Health Organization at the center.

## 3

#### Util Overview – their framework fails:

#### 1] Instability of the subject means moral theories can’t focus on individuals since there’s nothing that unifies them across time – that means only state of affairs have value and you should consequentially promote good ones

#### 2] Unstable affect proves personal identity doesn’t exist – that means util since it doesn’t matter how individuals relate to certain identarian categories, just hot to maximize benefits across people

#### 3] Their framework is impact-justified – the reason why majoritarianism is bad is because it creates violence towards certain groups which assumes util

#### 4] Bindingness – Deleuze is not motivational because even if our relations are determined through affect subjects don’t have a reason to follow them – util is motivational because putting your hand on a stove triggers a response to take it off – ethical theories must be motivational or else nobody would follow them

#### 5] Determinism – Deleuze says the subject is constantly affected by everything around it and which means there can be no constant subject that chooses to take in certain affects and proves their framework is impossible.

#### 6] Deleuze is too abstract and only makes things worse in the material world. Hallward 07 ©2007 Joshua Delpech-Ramey. All rights reserved. Delpech-Ramey, Joshua. “Without Art: Peter Hallward’s Out of This World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation.” Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory vol. 8 no. 3 (Fall 2007): 136-145. JOSHUA DELPECH RAMEY teaches in the Philosophy Department at Villanova University. Having written several articles on aesthetics and contemporary continental philosophy, he is currently completing a manuscript on unexplored connections between Deleuze and Renaissance philosophy.

According to Hallward, genuine materialist philosophers, among whom he includes figures such as Marx, Darwin, Sartre, and Badiou, all insist that “actual or worldly processes inflect the course of both natural and human history” while Deleuze**,** on the other hand, believes that only virtual or “spiritual” processes (as he tendentiously calls them) are the true determinants of natural and human lives.8 Virtual processes, which Deleuze variously calls intensities, singularities, sense- events, or folds, are described by Hallward as the harbingers of a cosmic creativity irreducible to actual causal or spatio-temporal dynamics. But then Hallward argues that despite equating Being with a creative process, Deleuze’s philosophy cannot count as a true materialism. Deleuze’s thought is not finally a philosophy attempting to change the actual world, but to escape it. Thought does not change actuality, but merely reacts to or “counter-actualizes” actual experience such that a contemplative, even mystical communion is established between thought and the creative forces of life. Whatever effects such contemplation may have on the actual world and its mundane affairs are ultimately irrelevant to the adventures of thought itself. Such, at least, is Hallward’s argument. Hallward’s claim about the whole of Deleuze’s thought, if true, is devastating to any attempt to relate Deleuze’s work to contemporary ethics and politic**s**. The claim is not that Deleuzian creativity does not transform the actual world in important ways, but that such transformation is fundamentally irrelevant because it is oriented beyond activity toward mere contemplation of the abstract essence of creativity itself. This claim, however, is based on a strategic misreading of Deleuze’s oeuvre. Although Hallward admits that his reading is neither a close textual exegesis nor an attempt to elucidate the details of any single one of Deleuze’s thoughts on time, the structure of events, the nature of repetition, or any of the other topics Deleuze’s vast work covers, Hallward does root his arguments deeply in Deleuze’s texts. Often this rooting takes strange liberties, such as the following passage from Hallward’s “Introduction” that splices a sentence from Deleuze’s Logic of Sense with Cinema I: The Movement-Image. Hallward writes, Rather than seek to elaborate rules for the consistent representation of reality**,** Deleuze sees the fundamental task of philosophy as exclusively conditioned by our immediate participation in reality. Rather than represent the world in a reliable way, Deleuze maintains that our real concern is to “know how the individual would be able to transcend his form and his syntactical link with the world” so as to become the transparent vessel for that “non-organic life of things which burns us, [...,] which is the divine part in us, the spiritual relationship in which we are alone with God as light” (LS 178; C1, 54).9 The crucial point missing here is that the “light” that is mentioned in the Cinema books is precisely the light of film itself. The “divine part in us” Deleuze is thinking of here is not that which removes us from one another, but that which joins us most intensely together in the creation of a work of art: it is the efforts which culminate in the projection of a film—as Deleuze himself once put it, there is no intersubjectivity except an artistic one.10 Consider the collective effort involved in making a movie, or making music, or works of theatre or dance. We transcend our organic forms and syntactical links with the world not as an act of dematerialization or evaporation, but as a concrete, messy experiment that can be carried out only in and as the work of making art, doing science, or creating philosophical concepts. It is Deleuze’s constant focus on work—his focus on the ideas of artistic and philosophical apprenticeship, initiation, and experimentation from Difference and Repetition through What is Philosophy?—that makes his thought materialist, but this is the aspect of Deleuze’s thought for which Hallward has the least attention.11

## A2 Permissibility and Presumption

**Presumption and permissibility negate –**

**a) statements are more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways**

**b) negating is harder – two justifications:**

**1] judge psychology – the aff gets to speak first and last which produces a cognitive bias against the neg**

**2] the aff has infinite prep time to strategically craft their ac – if we are equal on the flow I did the better debating**

**c) the aff has to prove an obligation which means lack of that obligation negates**

**d) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted which means the aff carries the burden of proof**

**e) moral repugnance – it’s ethically safer to presume prohibition because assuming permissibility allows for the chance that we’re wrong and commit morally horrible actions.**

**A2 True Until False - No true until false – they get the burden of proof wrong – we just assume it’s your name because we aren’t annoying people. Also, resolutions are complex statements that require a greater burden of proof – you expect an average person to know their name but not to evaluate morality in the context of the resolution.**

**A2 Can’t Trust Anything - Not trusting anything has not impact – I don’t trust anything and operate just fine. Also, epistemics disproves – our reasoning process operates outside of how the judge evaluates debate arguments which means their argument isn’t applicable.**