## 1

#### A: Interp – All arguments concerning fairness or education that the negative could violate must be read first in the affirmative speech. To clarify, theory arguments must be read at the top of the affirmative case before all substantive arguments. Evaluate the spirit of my interp to disincentive blippy i-meets.

#### B: Violation – Spikes on bottom

#### C. Standards –

#### 1. Strat skew – Absent spikes on top, I don’t know what I have to do until after I formulate a strategy which means I will always violate at least one of your spikes. Two impacts a) infinite abuse since ill always violate a norm and b) kills time tradeoff since I’m forced to spend all my prep restarting my strategy. My interp solves and is always net beneficial since I can understand what makes the round fair before I violate which is better for your strategy.

#### 2. Substantive engagement – I have to be able to understand the parameters for a fair strategy in order to engage in that strategy. This also allows for a better debate on the substantive layer that you want since I can spend more time thinking about a substantive strategy rather than thinking about a shell I can read on you before I get hit with 8 different spikes. Also, means independent reason to vote since the goal of the debate round is to ultimately get back to substance, so I preclude. My interp is also key to real world ed since always get the rulebook before we do the activity. Real world education is an independent reason to prefer the interpretation since it is the only skill that can affect us outside of rounds.

#### Voters –

## 2

#### A. Interpretation: If the affirmative differs from the conventional Truth Testing model, they must explicitly specify a comprehensive role of the ballot in the form of a text in the 1AC where they clarify how offense links back to the role of the ballot, such as whether post-fiat offense or pre-fiat offense matters and what constitutes that offense with implications on how to weigh

#### Multiple ways the AC violates:

#### C. Standards:

#### Engagement –

#### If I don't know how the role of the ballot functions, its impossible for me to engage the aff, since knowing what counts as offense for me is a prerequisite to being able to make meaningful arguments that clash with yours. Knowing what a legitimate advocacy is ensures that I read something that is relevant to your method, and knowing how to weigh gives us a standard for what is relevant, This is true of role of the ballots since there is no norm on what "performative engagement" is in the same way there is for what counts as util offense. Few impacts:

#### a) Education – when two ships pass in the night we don't learn anything, education is derived from analyzing and comparing each other's arguments. This also guts novice inclusion because now they can never learn arguments in round.

#### b) Link turns your role of the ballot – your impacts are premised on actually having a debate and engaging with issues of oppression. Almost impossible to engage roles of the ballot are uniquely bad since no one will take seriously a position that can't be clashed with, so you harm any progress your position can create.

#### c) Strategy Skew – You make formulating a strategy impossible since I don't know what links to your evaluative mechanism. My interp means we know what a legitimate neg advocacy is, otherwise you can make up reasons mine doesn't link to the role of the ballot in the next speech, and by specing a weighing mechanism I can know to make the most relevant arguments so you can't arbitrarily preclude them in the next speech.

#### Framing: You can't use your ROB to exclude my shell. My shell allows you to read your role of the ballot, it just functionally constrains how you can do that. Additionally, as long as I win comparative offense to my interp it precludes on a methodological level -my method is your ROTB with specification, your is just the ROTB, so if the former is better it's a reason to vote for me even if method debates in general preclude theory. Also, if they go for the Aff first that proves the abuse of my shell since they should have specified in the AC.

#### Voters: Fairness/Edu/DTD/CI/No RVI

## 3

#### 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

Polzler 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] UT AI

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- A democracy intrinsicially requires a majority of its 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.

## Case

#### Reject 1AR Theory They have 7-6 time skew They have two speeches on theory and I have one which is def irreciporcal Its not inf abuse because I only have 7 mins If you don’t buy that, Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is crazy aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing crazy abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance. DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it. No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A~ the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense B~ introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested which o/w’s on time frame since we can set higher quality norms. NEW 2N PARADIGMS