**0The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best proves the truth or falsity of the Resolution; the affirmative must prove it true and the negative must prove it false. Prefer:**

**A) Text: Five dictionaries define negate as to deny the truth of and affirm as to prove true which means the sole judge obligation is to vote on the resolution’s truth or falsity. Constitutivism outweighs because you don’t have the jurisdiction not to truth test. Jurisdiction is a meta constraint since every argument you make concedes the authority of the judge fulfilling their jurisdiction to vote aff if they affirm better and neg the contrary.**

**B) Logic: Any counter role of the ballot collapses to truth testing because every property assumes truth of the property i.e. if I say, “I am awake” it is the same as “it is true that I am awake” which means they are also a question of truth claims because it’s inherent.**

**C) Ground: Any offense can function under truth testing whereas your specific role of the ballot excludes all strategies but yours. This is bad for education because me engaging in a debate I know nothing about doesn’t help anyone.**

**D) Truth Testing is a prerequisite to other role of the ballots because without truth we’re operating off of lies which is what fuels propaganda and oppression.**

**The standard is consistency with popular support. To clarify our actions must be consistent with what polls conclude.**

**The metaethic is constructivism: Truth isn’t extrinsic but constructed by individuals based on their own perspective.**

**1. Opacity: We don’t know other peoples beliefs, because we can’t see into their minds. This means all truth is subjective, and frameworks must fit the metaethic or people disagree on how to use it.**

**2. Each person is their own creator of meaning – external truth does not exist.**

**Parrish 05,** Rick, "Derrida's economy of violence in Hobbes' social contract," Theory & Event 7.4 2005. NK.// ICW NW

The point, as Richard Beardsworth (one of Derrida’s most noteworthy commentators) explains, is that “a decision is always needed because **there is no natural status to language**, and that given this irreducibility of a decision, there are different kinds of decisions — those that recognize their legislative and executive force and those which hide it under some claim to naturality qua ‘theory’ or ‘objective science’.”22 In the first case the person recognizes and embraces its status as a creator of meaning, but in the second case the person more closely resembles Nietzsche’s scientific ascetic who, while still a person and thus a creator, denies his nature and instead claims to discover fact. But in either event, **a person “is always . . . a legislator** and policeman,”23 **a creator and** subsequent **enforcer of** its **creations of meaning and value.** So for Derrida, any discursive positioning is the outcome of an ordeal of the undecidable that is itself necessary because **there is no objective, transparently discoverable truth.** Rather, persons exist as the choosers, the creators, of discursive positionality (meaning; value). Violence is then the unavoidable denial of the other as a source of meaning independent of oneself. Derrida argues that both pure violence and pure non-violence are paradoxical, but before explaining this point I shall lay out why Hobbes agrees that humans are the creators of meaning and value, and proceed from there. Perhaps the single most telling quote from Hobbes on this point comes from The Philosophical Rudiments Concerning Government and Society (usually known by its Latin name, De Cive), in which he states that “to know truth, is the same thing as to remember that it was made by ourselves by the very usurpation of the words.”24 “For Hobbes truth is a function of logic and language, not of the relation between language and some extralinguistic reality,”25 so the **“connections between names and objects are not natural.”26 They are artificially constructed by persons, based on individual psychologies**

**3. People are self interested, morality must be internally motivating because we must internalize and care about external claims, which means external motivation collapses.**

**Joyce 1**, Richard (Professor of Philosophy at Victoria University Wellington, New Zealand). The Myth of Morality. 2001. [Bracketed for grammatical clarity] // ICW NW

Back to the [Suppose] external reason[s]. **Suppose it were claimed,** instead, that **I have a reason to refrain from drinking the coffee because it is tapu** and must not be touched. This reason claim will be urged regardless of what I may say about my indifference to tapu, or my citing of nihilistic desires to tempt the hand of fate. **[r]egardless of my desires (it is claimed) I ought not drink** - l have a reason not to drink. But how could that reason ever explain any action of mine? Could the external reason even explain my [action] from drinking? Clearly, in order to explain it the external reason must have some causally efficacious role [in] among the antecedents of the action (in this case, an omission) — l must have. in some manner. "internalized" it. **The only possibility, it would seem, consistent with its being an external reason, is that I believe the external reason** claim [but] : I believe that the coffee is tapu. There's no doubting that such a belief can play a role in explaining actions - including my refraining from drinking the coffee. The question is whether the belief alone can[not] produce action, to which the correct answer is “No.” A very familiar and eminently sensible view says that **in order to explain an action** the **belief must couple with desires** (such that those same desires had in the absence of the belief would not have resulted in the action). And this seems correct: **if I believe that the coffee is** [bad] **tapu but really just don’t care about that, then I will not refrain from drinking it.** So in order for the belief to explain action it must couple with [desire] elements - but **in that case** the putative **external reason collapses into** an **internal** one.3

**This justifies the metaethic because people only care about the truth they construct.**

**Perspectivism leads to polls:**

**1. If truth is constructed it doesn’t make any sense to assert your view of the world is “more true” than someone else's, because objective facts don’t exist. Truth is constructed, thus whatever most people think is the case is the truth because it’s what has been constructed by society as the truth.**

**2. Aggregation: The place disagreement arises is the formulation of truth and which truth is better. We can’t understand how others come to their conclusions, just what they conclude. Thus, we should aggregate conclusions because those are the only facts epistemically accessible.**

**3. Probability: Since truth is constructed, it doesn’t make sense to say one view is a priori better than another, so we can only discuss truth probabilistically. What the most people think is true is more likely the case because all of our truths are equally constructed so we should assign everyone an equal value. If they disprove constructivism it means certain people do have a better understanding of moral facts, so we should listen to the most ethical people in society since they’re smarter about how ethics works.**

**Prefer additionally:**

**1. Actor Spec: a) Polls are a side constraint on all governmental action. Legislatures look at how the public reacts to what they do to decide if they will do it or not. b) Every decision the government makes is through a poll, congress makes decisions by seeing what gets the most votes. This outweighs because different actors have different ethical standings.**

**2. Linguistics: Language is entirely subjective to what society views words as, the reason certain words have certain connotations and meanings is because of how society views their use. There is no extrinsic reason a chair is called a chair, it is called that because of what people as an aggregate decide to call it. This means my framework is a prerequisite to using other frameworks.**

**3. Only social norms solve interpretive regress: Rules don’t outline how to follow each part of them which means there are infinite interpretations, the only way to clarify is with another rule but that just needs more rules to outline how to follow that rule. Polls solve because we can understand what the aggregate decides instead of one perspective. I.e. if the rule is “Don’t steal'', I wouldn’t be *wrong* to conclude that was a command to a guy named don’t but due to collective understanding we know that's silly.**

**4. Util thinks we should consult virtuous people to determine ethicality. a) it's dependent on unknown facts about the future, which are up to interpretation. We should use the interpretation of those that practice ethical actions since they're better at using util than immoral people. b) It’s the most practical since, we can just get the answer to all ethical questions, which promotes net pleasure in decisions, and ensures we don’t make mistakes that cause bad things.**

**Consequences Fail**

**1. We can’t predict the future which means we can’t predict the consequences of an action since things can happen during our actions that cause a completely different consequence.**

**2. Normativity: If people are held responsible for things they didn’t intend it means they have no control over their actions being immoral. This outweighs because people will give up on morality if they’re blamed for things they didn’t do.**

**3. Calculation freezes action: We have to calculate the results of every action yet calculation is itself an action, which means once we calculate we just keeping adding actions to calculate, and just spend our entire life calculating.**

**4. Trust Paradox: Consequentialism obligates changes in actions on a case by case basis which means every action is subject to calculation and thus people act sporadically, meaning we can’t predict what others will do. But consequentialism necessitates that we can make predictions which means it’s paradoxical and impossible to use.**

**Contention 1)** **Polls affirm.**

**Amnesty International**. "Global: Majority of Public Wants Big Pharma to Share Vaccine Technology-New Poll." *Amnesty International*, 4 May 20**21**, [**www.amnesty.org.uk/press-releases/global-majority-public-wants-big-pharma-share-vaccine-technology-new-poll**](http://www.amnesty.org.uk/press-releases/global-majority-public-wants-big-pharma-share-vaccine-technology-new-poll). Accessed 12 Aug. 2021. ICW NW

**The poll** carried out by the [**People’s Vaccine Alliance**](https://peoplesvaccine.org/), which includes Amnesty International, **shows** that in G7 countries **70% of people want governments to ensure vaccine research is shared. Support for government intervention is highest in Italy, where 82% of respondents were in favour,** while **in the UK 74% want governments to prevent “Big Pharma” monopolies -** a sentiment which runs counter to Prime Minister Boris Johnson's claim that the UK’s successful vaccine rollout has been due to “greed and capitalism”. UK support for intervention on vaccines is consistently high despite political divides - with the idea backed by 73% of Conservative voters, 83% of Labour supporters and 79% of Liberal Democrats voters, as well as among 83% of Remain and 72% of Leave voters in the EU referendum. In the USA, where President Biden has voiced his “hope and expectation” for sharing vaccine know-how, 69% of the public support the measure. The polling shows that while the public generally believes that drug companies should be fairly compensated for developing vaccines, they also think should be prevented from holding a monopoly on the jabs. The polling comes as G7 foreign and development ministers meet in London today - the bloc’s first in-person meeting in two years, while the General Council of the World Trade Organisation is also meeting online today. Greed vs Covid Despite widespread public support for sharing vaccine know-how, G7 governments have nevertheless continued to support pharmaceutical monopolies on Covid-19 vaccinations. More than 100 countries, led by India and South Africa, have proposed a temporary waiver of intellectual property rights on Covid-19 vaccines at the WTO, but the proposal has been blocked by powerful countries - including the UK, the US, Canada and Japan, as well as the EU. However, the USA has confirmed it is reconsidering its opposition to the waiver. To date, no company with an effective vaccine has joined the [**World Health Organisation’s Covid-19 Technology Access Pool (C-TAP)**](https://www.who.int/initiatives/covid-19-technology-access-pool), which was established to facilitate sharing blueprints for vaccines and treatments. Moderna, Pfizer/BioNtech, Johnson & Johnson, Novovax and Oxford/AstraZeneca have received billions in public funding and guaranteed pre-orders, including $12 billion from the US government alone. An estimated 97% of funding for the Oxford/AstraZeneca vaccine came from public sources. The companies have paid out a combined $26 billion in dividends and stock buybacks to their shareholders this year, enough to vaccinate at least 1.3 billion people, equivalent to the population of Africa. *Steve Cockburn, Head of Economic and Social Justice at Amnesty International, said:* “G7 governments have clear human rights obligations to put the lives of millions of people across the world ahead of the interests of the pharmaceutical companies that they have funded. It would be a gross failure of leadership to continue blocking the sharing of life-saving technologies and would only serve to prolong the immense pain and suffering caused by this pandemic.” *Heidi Chow, Senior Campaigns and Policy Manager at Global Justice Now, said:* “The public doesn’t want big pharma to hold monopolies on vaccines that were developed largely with public money. These vaccines are a global public good that should be available to everyone, everywhere. That much is obvious to the public across G7 nations, but political leaders are burying their heads in the sand while people die around them.” *Saoirse Fitzpatrick, STOPAIDS Advocacy Manager said:* “The horrific situation in India should shake G7 leaders to their core. Now is not the time for an ideological defence of intellectual property rules. Bilateral deals with pharmaceutical companies have not worked. Governments need to step in and force pharmaceutical companies to share their intellectual property and vaccine know-how with the world.” *Anna Marriott, Health Policy Manager at Oxfam, said:* “People are dying by the thousands in low and middle-income countries while rich nations have jumped the vaccine queue. G7 leaders need to face up to reality. We don’t have enough vaccines for everyone and the biggest barrier to increasing supply is that a few profit-hungry pharmaceutical corporations keep the rights to produce them under lock and key. It’s time to waive the intellectual property rules, ramp up production and put people’s lives before profits. It’s time for a People’s Vaccine.” UK must push for ‘global common good’ As G7 chair, the UK has proposed a Pandemic Preparedness Plan, to be discussed by ministers this week. However, the plan fails to address the issue of monopolies and intellectual property. Pharmaceutical corporations such as Pfizer are part of the group preparing the proposal, but governments and vaccine producers from developing countries have not been asked to join. Last month, **175 former world leaders and Nobel laureates** - including Gordon Brown, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf and Francoise Hollande - **wrote to President Biden in support of a temporary waiving of intellectual property rights for** Covid-19 **vaccines.** Additionally, 150 faith leaders - including Rowan Williams, the former archbishop of Canterbury; Thabo Makgoba, the Anglican archbishop of Cape Town; and Cardinal Peter Turkson of the Roman Catholic Church - have called on G7 leaders to consider Covid-19 vaccines a “global common good”. World-leading epidemiologists have warned that the continued spread of the virus could allow vaccine-resistant strains of Covid-19 to render our current vaccines ineffective within a year. SAGE, the independent public health advisory group which provides advice to the UK government, have also called for a patent waiver to address urgent supply issues.

**Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus is my solvency advocate.**

**The Associated Press.** "WHO Head Wants Virus Vaccine Patents Waived to Boost Supply." *Acess WDUN*, 5 Mar. 20**21**, accesswdun.com/article/2021/3/985133. Accessed 12 Aug. 2021. ICW NW

**The head of the World Health Organization called** Friday **for patent rights to be waived** until the end of the coronavirus pandemic so that vaccine supplies can be dramatically increased, saying these “unprecedented times” warrant the move. At a press briefing, WHO chief Tedros Adhanom **Ghebreyesus said countries with their own vaccine capacity should “start waiving intellectual property rights** ” as provided in special emergency provisions from the World Trade Organization. “These provisions are there for use in emergencies,” Tedros said. “If now is not a time to use them, then when?” He said the WHO would be meeting soon with representatives of the industry to identify bottlenecks in production and discuss how to solve them.

**He’s a qualified solvency advocate.**

**Foulkes**, Imogen. "Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus: The Ethiopian at the Heart of the Coronavirus Fight." *BBC News*, 7 May 20**20**, **www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-51720184**. Accessed 12 Aug. 2021. ICW NW

**Dr Tedros,** as he likes to be known, **is the first African head of the WHO.**

**He took office** two-and-a-half years ago **promising to reform the organisation, and to tackle the illnesses that kill millions each year:** malaria, measles, childhood pneumonia, and HIV/Aids. A certain political wiliness has become apparent too as Dr Tedros faces down more than just the virus itself. **He has weathered bitter criticism** - most notably from the US - of his handling of the pandemic, which the WHO declared a Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC) on 30 January. A PHEIC is the WHO's highest level of health emergency. That means it requires 24-hour monitoring, deployment of medical staff, equipment and medicines, daily discussions with affected countries and countries who might be affected, and of course, a steady stream of reliable information for an anxious world desperate for immediate answers. A huge task for the "charming" and "unassuming" 55-year-old at the organisation's head. At his first press conference as WHO director general, the Geneva-based journalists quickly realised Dr Tedros' style would be very different. He strolled in smiling, sat down and chatted in a very relaxed way, his voice sometimes so quiet it was difficult to hear him. That was a very big change from his more formal predecessor, Margaret Chan. And yet, behind that quiet manner, there lies a very determined man. **Before becoming head of the WHO, he climbed through the ranks of Ethiopia's government, becoming health minister and then foreign minister.** He could not have risen that far by being self-effacing. How brother's tragic death motivated him Dr Tedros was born in 1965 in Asmara, which became Eritrea's capital after independence from Ethiopia in 1991, and grew up in northern Ethiopia's Tigray region. One formative, and now motivating experience, was the death of a younger brother, who was around four years old at the time, [**he told Time magazine in November**](https://time.com/5735544/world-health-organization-chief-tedros-adhanom-ghebreyesus-interview/). Later, as a student, Dr Tedros came to suspect it was measles that killed him. "I didn't accept it; I don't accept it even now," he was quoted as saying, adding that it was unfair that a child should die from a preventable disease just because he was born in the wrong place. "All roads should lead to universal health coverage. I will not rest until we have met this," he told the World Health Assembly shortly before his election as WHO chief. As the coronavirus pandemic exposes the fragility of even the richest countries' health sectors in a crisis, Dr Tedros and his supporters believe it's the best argument there is for a radical global commitment to universal health coverage. **Dr Tedros became a member of the** Tigray People's Liberation Front (**TPLF**), **which was in the vanguard of the** 1991 **overthrow of Ethiopia's** Marxist **dictator,** Mengistu Haile Mariam. As a government minister from 2005, **he was seen as** more **approachable and friendly** than some of his more austere TPLF comrades. **He has been praised for reforming the health sector and improving access to health care in Ethiopia,** Africa's most populous state after Nigeria. But when he was in charge, his ministry was known to discourage journalists from reporting about suspected cholera cases in the country.

**I defend the whole resolution, I’ll clarify anything about my advocacy in cross and change within reason if asked.**

**Underview**

**1.** **Presumption affirms. A) we presume things true until proven otherwise, I.e. you believed me when I said my name was Nate. B) It’s impossible to presume things false because then we presume that presumption is false but that also leads to a falsity, and it’s infinitely regressive.**

**2.** **Permissibility affirms, none of their arguments about the aff having to prove an obligation apply because my argument is permissible actions are obligatory A) it’s better for us to take okay actions than bad ones, and B) Otherwise we would need a proactive justification to do things like drink water. C) If things aren’t prohibited by a framework it means they’re included under it, and thus good actions if the framework is good.**

**3.** **I get 1ar theory because otherwise the neg can be infinitely abusive which outweighs everything because that makes it impossible for the aff to win.**

**4.** **Paradigm Issues: Drop the debater a) to deter future abuse, b) if I prove abuse it means substance has already been skewed. No RVIs, a) debaters don’t win for just being fair or educational, b) it would encourage good theory debaters to be abusive so they can bait theory and win off an RVI. Competing interps because a) reasonability is arbitrary and requires judge intervention b) it encourages getting as close to the brightline as possible and**

**5.** **Fairness is a voter because the ballot makes debate a game and without fairness you’re voting for the better cheater not the better debater.**

**6.** **No 2N theory because that allows the neg to just go for 6 minutes of new game over issues which is impossible for a 3 minute 2ar to deal with.**

**7.** **The negative must not contest the affirmative metaethic if the aff metaethic is constructivism. Standard:**

**Time Skew: When the neg can just outframe the aff it moots the 6 minute AC since my aff links back to my framework which links to my metaethic, creating a 7 to 13 skew. Time Skew controls the internal link to everything because I can’t do things like clash if I have no time to do so.**

**8.** **Interpretation: The negative must defend the status quo. Standard:**

**Predictability:**