### 1

#### Interpretation: if the affirmative debater says allow 2AR responses to blippy 1nc tricks, they must clarify what a blippy 1NC trick is.

#### Violation: They don’t

#### Infinite abuse -

### 2

#### Interpretation: Debaters must provide sources for all evidence and definitions cited

#### Violation: they don’t for “nation” and “resolve”

#### 1] Evidence ethics- It’s impossible to verify in-round whether or not their evidence was fabricated because there’s no direct link to their evidence. We don’t know what page the highlighted section is on or how we can even get to their evidence otherwise – that’s a voter since it is an academic d-rule to not cheat which outweighs because of sequencing – it questions my ability to engage with their arguments

#### 2] Inclusion- Them not providing direct links to sources crowds out small school debaters since not providing sci-hub or pdf links that get you access to pay-walled articles put them at a disadvantage from the very beginning

### 3

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement –

#### 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.

#### Negate –

#### 1] member[[1]](#footnote-1) is “a part or organ of the body, especially a limb” but an organ can’t have obligations

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 4

#### 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 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.

1. 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-1)
2. 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-2)
3. 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-3)
4. 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-4)
5. 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-5)
6. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/for#:~:text=English%20Language%20Learners%20Definition%20of,meant%20to%20be%20used%20with [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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-7)