### 1

#### Interp: The affirmative must disclose the plan text and advantage area if they break new.

**V:They didn’t--see screenshot**

Graphical user interface

Description automatically generated with low confidence

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

#### Standards –

#### 1. Clash – having no idea what the debate will be about makes being neg impossible – the aff gets plan text choice and infinite prep to craft the most strategic case. No disclosure makes this impossible to overcome b/c it means the neg only gets 4 mins of prep to answer a strategy that they had a full month for. they’ll say generics, but their model of debate means the neg has no time to cut an update to their generics specific to the AFF and we’ll lose every debate.

#### 2. Discourages tricks – plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot aff’s. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, the case should lose. The neg is entitled to some research time to make sure the AFF is inherent, topical, and controversial. Otherwise bad AFF’s can win on purely surprise factor, which is a bad model b/c it encourages finding the most fringe surprising case possible instead of a well researched and defensible aff.

#### Vote on substantive engagement: otherwise we’re speaking without debating and there’s nothing to separate us from dueling oratory. It also creates the most valuable long-term skills since we need to learn how to defend our beliefs in any context, like politics.

#### Drop the debater on new affs: Their lack of disclosure makes substance irreparable b/c our entire argument is that we did not have a basis to engage the aff to begin with.

#### Competing interps since reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge’s tolerance for questionable argumentation.

### 2

#### Interpretation – the Affirmative must present a delineated enforcement mechanism for the Plan. To clarify they must state in in their speech - There is no normal means since terms are negotiated contextually among member states.

WTO "Whose WTO is it anyway?" <https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/org1_e.htm> //Elmer

**When WTO rules impose disciplines** on countries’ policies, **that is the outcome of negotiations among WTO members.** The rules are **enforced** **by** the **members themselves** **under agreed procedures that they negotiated**, **including the possibility of trade sanctions**. But those sanctions are imposed by member countries, and authorized by the membership as a whole. This is quite different from other agencies whose bureaucracies can, for example, influence a country’s policy by threatening to withhold credit.

#### Violation: “through the states” doesn’t cut it

#### Standards:

#### 1. Shiftiness- They can redefine the 1AC’s enforcement mechanism in the 1AR which allows them to recontextualize their enforcement mechanism to wriggle out of DA’s since all DA links are predicated on type of enforcement i.e. sanctions bad das, domestic politics das off of backlash, information research sharing da if they put monetary punishments, or trade das.

#### 2. Real World - Policy makers will always specify how the mandates of the plan should be endorsed. It also means zero solvency, absent spec, states can circumvent the Aff’s policy since there is no delineated way to enforce the affirmative which means there’s no way to actualize any of their solvency arguments.

#### ESpec isn’t regressive or arbitrary- it’s an active part of the WTO is central to any advocacy about international IP law since the only uniqueness of a reduction of IP protections is how effective its enforcement is.

#### Paradigm:

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier.

#### Fairness – Debate is a competitive activity governed by rules. You can’t evaluate who did better debating if the round is structurally skewed, so fairness is a gateway to substantive debate.

#### DTD – Time spent on theory cant be compensated for, the 1nc was already skewed, and its key to deterring abuse.

#### Prefer Competing interps -

#### 1. reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention.

#### 2. it Causes a race to the bottom where debaters push the limit as to how reasonably abusive, they can be.

#### No RVI’s -

#### 1. Chills some debaters from reading theory against abusive postions.

#### 2. incentivizes theory baiting where you can just bait theory to win

### 3

#### Interpretation: Debaters may not justify 1ar theory is dtd, no rvi, competing interps, no 2n theory paradigm issues , and it’s the highest layer

#### Violation: its all in the underview

#### Standard:

#### 1. Infinite Abuse - their norm justifies the affirmative auto winning every round since they can read infinite risk free 1AR shells with DTD and Competing interp. And since I don’t have 2n paradigm issues I can’t contest it. Even if I uplayer I can’t win since your shell is the highest layer. Answering the argument doesn’t solve because you can read infinite of these paradigm issues in the 1ac making it impossible. Norming is an independent voter since justifying the value of debate necessarily justifies the norms of the activity being good in order for debate to be valuable.

### 4

#### Ethical community fails / we still win under tt

#### Ethical disagreement is inevitable-

#### A] Relativity problem- I can never witness the world from anyone else’s perspective which means our understanding of the world will inevitably be different and require distinct ethical obligations to account for our unique social location

#### B] Empirics- Best studies prove ethical differences are inevitable

Pölzler and Wright 19[Thomas Pölzler and Jennifer Cole Wright- “Empirical research on folk moral objectivism” <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6686698/> NCBI. Published July 5th 2019]

Examining these studies' results more closely, however, makes it less clear whether this interpretation is appropriate (Pölzler, 2018b). Take again Goodwin and Darley's study. In this study, almost 30% of subjects' responses to the disagreement measure and almost 50% of their responses to the truth‐aptness measure fell on the option that the researchers took to be indicative of subjectivism (Goodwin & Darley, 2008, pp. 1347, 1351). Moreover, while some moral statements were dominantly classified as objective (e.g., the above statement about robbery), many others were dominantly classified as nonobjective (e.g., the stem cell research statement). This suggests that subjects in Goodwin and Darley's study may have actually favored what Wright, Grandjean, and McWhite (2013) called “metaethical pluralism,” i.e., they sometimes sided with objectivism and other times with nonobjectivism. More recent studies have by and large confirmed this hypothesis of folk metaethical pluralism. Wright et al. (2013) and Wright, McWhite, and Grandjean (2014), for example, replicated Goodwin and Darley's results, using the exact same measures, but letting subjects classify the presented statements as moral and nonmoral themselves. Objectivity ratings for statements that were dominantly self‐classified as moral varied between as little as 5% and as much as 85%. Research based on different measures yielded high proportions of intrapersonal variation as well (e.g., Beebe, 2014; Beebe, Qiaoan, Wysocki, & Endara, 2015; Beebe & Sackris, 2016; Fisher, Knobe, Strickland, & Keil, 2017; Goodwin & Darley, 2012; Heiphetz & Young, 2017; Wright, 2018; Zijlstra, forthcoming‐a).2

#### Resolving such differences requires a fair, non-arbitrary method that isn’t biased in its ability to make normative judgements. Thus, the standard is consistency with the public will. Only aggregating ethical viewpoints into an omni-perspective presents us with the fairest way to determine how to make ethical action. Any other ethical calculus is arbitrary and non-objective in its approach to conflict.

#### Prefer

#### 1] Constutivism- Nations intrinsicially require a majority of their citizens to consider a policy legitimate. This makes our framework most actor-specific and contextual.

#### 2] Regress- Polls prevents infinite regress of asking why and how a moral action or evaluation is attributable to the agent, as (1) agents consent to policy so the regress terminates in internal motivation or (2) defines the duties and boundaries of state policy which contextualizes how certain actions are attributable to governments.

#### Now Negate-

#### 1] Polls decisively negate

Hicks 5/14 [Cynthia Hicks (Director of Public Affairs at PhRMA focusing on polling and opinion research that supports advocacy communications and strategy). “New polling shows Americans are sounding the alarm on the TRIPS IP waiver”. Phrma. May 14, 2021. Accessed 8/27/21. <https://catalyst.phrma.org/new-polling-shows-americans-are-sounding-the-alarm-on-the-trips-ip-waiver> //Xu]

Last week, the Biden administration announced support for a waiver of the World Trade Organization (WTO) Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement, which could lead to the removal of intellectual property protections for manufacturers of COVID-19 vaccines and treatments – a move some have suggested will speed global access in countries devastated by recent surges. However, once you peel back the layers of the TRIPS waiver and understand the risks to health and safety, recent data shows that Americans want a better way. In fact, a recent Hill-HarrisX poll found that a majority of Americans – 57% – oppose the waiver. Recent polling conducted by Morning Consult on behalf of PhRMA echoed these strong concerns around the dangerous consequences of waiving intellectual property – including risks to public safety and vaccine manufacturing – and explored alternatives that could better expand global access to life-saving vaccines and treatments. Below are three notable findings: 1. While Americans want to expand global access to vaccines, they would prefer to build on successful U.S. manufacturing rather than waive patents. Americans support expanding vaccine access globally. In fact, 70% of registered voters believe it is a “top priority” to ensure COVID-19 vaccines become widely available for all countries, including 82% of Democrats and 56% of Republicans. However, they would prefer to build on existing U.S. manufacturing efforts rather than undermine patents through the TRIPS waiver. When asked to choose between the two, a strong majority – 56% – prefers that we “build upon successful U.S. manufacturing of COVID-19 vaccines to increase global supply, donate excess doses and increase licensing agreements with foreign manufacturers to increase supply.” Conversely, only 23% of voters support waiving intellectual property rights of U.S. manufacturers as the means to that end. 2. Americans are concerned that the TRIPS waiver could risk patient safety, sow public confusion, and cede America’s global innovation leadership to China. Americans worry that waiving intellectual property introduces unnecessary and dangerous risks to safety and vaccine manufacturing. The top concerns – expressed by more than six in ten voters – include the following: 3. Americans want strong intellectual property and more collaboration to expand global access. Americans across party lines support intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines. In fact, three-quarters (75%) believe that the U.S. needs strong intellectual property protections to encourage innovation. In looking to solutions, 4-in-5 voters (80%) say that vaccine manufacturers working together to help get vaccines to poorer countries is important. This collaboration was the top-ranked alternative to the TRIPS waiver for supporters of both parties: 84% support among Democrats and 74% support among Republicans. Voters also strongly support the following approaches to help increase global COVID-19 vaccine and treatment access: Increasing production targets from manufacturers (73%); U.S. vaccine developers partnering directly with manufacturers in poorer countries (71%); Providing financial support and in-kind donations to local organizations in poorer countries (69%); Increasing American vaccine exports (69%); and Making new commitments to the global vaccine equity initiative COVAX (68%). Americans want a better way toward COVID-19 vaccine and treatment equity than what the TRIPS waiver would offer: one that involves protecting strong intellectual property, building on the United States’ innovation and manufacturing leadership to date, increasing collaboration, and addressing the true impediments to access, such as infrastructure, last-mile distribution and trade barriers.

### 5

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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 and it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

#### no 1ar arguments bc they require intervention to evaluate them against the nc

#### 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. Truth Testing comes before theory because it questions the validity of theory and your ability to test its true which means it’s a procedural framing question of what arguments should look like.

#### 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] member[[3]](#footnote-3) is “a part or organ of the body, especially a limb” but an organ can’t have obligations

#### 2] of[[4]](#footnote-4) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 3] the[[5]](#footnote-5) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

#### 4] to[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### 5] reduce[[7]](#footnote-7) is to “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.

#### 6] for[[8]](#footnote-8) is “in place of” but medicines aren’t replacing IP.

#### 7] medicine[[9]](#footnote-9) 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.

#### 8] Good Samaritan Paradox -- affirming negates because in order to say you want to fix x problem, that assumes x problem exists in the first place, thus eliminating nukes presupposes nukes exist which means negation is a prior question

#### 9] Zeno’s Paradox – motion is impossible, because moving half way causes half more and half more which is infinitely regressive and means elimination of arsenals is logically impossible

#### **10] The holographic principle is the most reasonable conclusion**

Stromberg 15[Joseph Stromberg- “Some physicists believe we're living in a giant hologram — and it's not that far-fetched” <https://www.vox.com/2015/6/29/8847863/holographic-principle-universe-theory-physics> Vox. June 29th 2015] War Room Debate AI

Some physicists actually believe that the universe we live in might be a hologram. The idea isn't that the universe is some sort of fake simulation out of The Matrix, but rather that even though we appear to live in a three-dimensional universe, it might only have two dimensions. It's called the holographic principle. The thinking goes like this: Some distant two-dimensional surface contains all the data needed to fully describe our world — and much like in a hologram, this data is projected to appear in three dimensions. Like the characters on a TV screen, we live on a flat surface that happens to look like it has depth. It might sound absurd. But when physicists assume it's true in their calculations, all sorts of big physics problems — such as the nature of black holes and the reconciling of gravity and quantum mechanics — become much simpler to solve. In short, the laws of physics seem to make more sense when written in two dimensions than in three. "It's not considered some wild speculation among most theoretical physicists," says Leonard Susskind, the Stanford physicist who first formally defined the idea decades ago. "It's become a working, everyday tool to solve problems in physics." But there's an important distinction to be made here. There's no direct evidence that our universe actually is a two-dimensional hologram. These calculations aren't the same as a mathematical proof. Rather, they're intriguing suggestions that our universe could be a hologram. And as of yet, not all physicists believe we have a good way of testing the idea experimentally.

#### 11] 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 an idea since that tolerance relies on excluding a perspective.

#### 12] Decision Making Paradox- in order to decide to do the affirmative we need a decision-making procedure to enact it, vote for it, and to determine it is a good decision. But to chose a decision-making procedure requires another meta level decision making procedure leading to infinite regress since every decision requires another decision to chose how to make a decision.

#### Permissibility Negates

#### A] aff has burden of proof and any eeason they’re wrong negates

#### B] you believe statements are false until proven true which is why you don’t believe in things like simulations and demons

#### Reject 1ar Theory and independent voting issues as reasons to reject the team,

#### the 1ar by JD cannot have overview responses because it allows them to avoid line by line engagement, must concede truth testing so we learn the value of debating truth and falsity and come to an objective conclusion

#### a. 7 - 6 time skew means they have a structural advantage

#### b. No 3nr, so 2ar gets to weigh however they want

#### c. Judges are more likely to by 2a arguments as they are the

#### last speech

#### d. Too many theory flows make it impossible to test the aff

#### e. You get a 2-1 speech advantage

#### f. We only get 2 speeches of new arguments to deliberate over your shell which isn’t enough time

#### g. there’s no such thing as infinite abuse as NC only has 7 minutes

#### h. 1ar theory is used as a strategic advantage

#### Even if you don’t buy reject it-it’s a reason why its’ drop the arg and reasonability

#### Evaluate the debate after the 1NC and before the 1ar to limit judge intervention and so we can all do our homework. Evaluating after the 1nc means after my speech you look at your flow and extend all of my arguments because there’s no response so you assume they’re true and vote on the dropped truth testing + definitions bc they prove the aff is incoherent or on log con bc the aff wont happen or theory because it means they were abusive and you need to drop the debater

.

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> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. https://www.google.com/search?q=member+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=member+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i60l3.1863j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i61l3.1473j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.1976j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. https://www.google.com/search?q=to+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=to+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60l3.1415j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. https://www.google.com/search?q=reduce+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&sxsrf=AOaemvI3lZsbmnXg5WHeL4m6rYGn8Vf6Aw%3A1630610232638&ei=OCMxYbCaJpO0tQb6wpGoCA&oq=reduce+definition&gs\_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyCQgjECcQRhD5ATIECAAQQzIECAAQQzIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQ6BwgAEEcQsAM6BwgAELADEEM6BwgjEOoCECc6BAgjECc6BQgAEJECOhEILhCABBCxAxCDARDHARDRAzoKCAAQsQMQgwEQQzoHCAAQsQMQQzoICAAQgAQQsQM6CAgAELEDEIMBOgoIABCABBCHAhAUSgQIQRgAUMLMBFjS3QRgnt8EaAJwAngDgAG2A4gB-heSAQozLjExLjEuMi4xmAEAoAEBsAEKyAEKwAEB&sclient=gws-wiz&ved=0ahUKEwiwlru9gOHyAhUTWs0KHXphBIUQ4dUDCA8&uact=5 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/for#:~:text=English%20Language%20Learners%20Definition%20of,meant%20to%20be%20used%20with [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. https://www.google.com/search?q=medicine+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=medicine+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59.2986j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)