## 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative debater must defend policy implementation of the resolution, “****The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.****

#### The World Trade Organization is:

"What is the WTO?," <https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/thewto_e.htm>

The World Trade Organization (WTO) is the only global international organization dealing with the rules of trade between nations. At its heart are the WTO agreements, negotiated and signed by the bulk of the world’s trading nations and ratified in their parliaments. The goal is to ensure that trade flows as smoothly, predictably and freely as possible.

#### Intellectual property and rights are:

"Intellectual property" refers to creations of the mind. These creations can take many different forms, such as artistic expressions, signs, symbols and names used in commerce, designs and inventions. Governments grant creators the right to prevent others from using their inventions, designs or other creations — and to use that right to negotiate payment in return for others using them. These are “intellectual property rights”. They take a number of forms. For example, books, paintings and films come under copyright; eligible inventions can be patented; brand names and product logos can be registered as trademarks; and so on. Governments grant creators these rights as an incentive to produce and spread ideas that will benefit society as a whole.

#### Violation: They don’t defend the topic and gain performative offense from the aff.

#### Standards:

#### [1] Limits – the resolution creates a stasis point for negative engagement and constrains what topical debate looks like. Topic lit is primarily policy-based, and not defending implementation moots core neg generics (like innovation, vaccine safety, ip limitations, etc.) , and other post-fiat offense], causing massive prep skew. That exacerbates resource disparities since only debaters with a bunch of coaches can generate enough prep for every non-policy aff in the direction of the topic – accessibility is an independent voter – key to equal normsetting and diverse perspectives in debate. Limits key to engaging the aff from multiple angles which o/w since testing is the role of the neg. We’re forced to read generic method k’s they’ll have prepped out. Also key to deliberation – if the neg can’t read its best prep, we can’t determine if their method is good or portable – o/w it’s the constitutive purpose of debate.

#### [2] SSD – our model is one of self-reflexivity, forcing debaters to not just engage in one style of debate but discover an intersectional approach that allows critique within the context of a topical plan. Solves their offense – they get access to their framing and offense as long as it’s topical and can read the aff as a K on the neg. Disidentification serves as the balance that causes policy debaters to understand critical literature and vice versa – o/w on portability – pure critique is less likely to gain traction because of widespread societal dogmas.

#### [3] Ground – they get to choose any topic which makes negating impossible. They defend a body of literature they know much more about and can additionally defend topics like “racism bad” which has no negative ground.

#### Fairness first and you don’t get cross-apps:

#### [1] Constitutiveness – All argumentation presupposes fairness that the judge won’t hack for either side. You can’t impact turn this – because you rely that the judge won’t hack for me which means you implicitly value fairness. Just like hacking is against the rules, so too is not defending the topic.

#### [2] Evaluation – Judges can’t evaluate the round if skewed, just like an official allowed an athlete on steroids into a competition. If the judge can’t evaluate the aff fairly it means you don’t get access to the impacts because they aren’t ever evaluated on the same field.

#### [3] Accessibility – Unfair activities cause people to quit. The circuit is already inaccessible to countless minority groups and a method of inclusion is best. This turns case – you’re making the debate space worse for minority novices which o/w because it precludes future engagement and anti-racism.

#### [4] Truth testing – If the affirmative can’t be evaluated fairly then we don’t know the truth value of any of the claims. If a student cheated on a test, we wouldn’t treat the results as legitimate because they engaged in a way antithetical to the rules of the activity.

#### Debate is good

#### [1] The nature of the activity is one that questions governmental structures and modes of thought since we are allowed to read whatever arguments we desire without imposition by some higher authority

#### [2] The context of debate is where many individuals learn arguments that they carry throughout their life in the real world, aiding the development of moral individuals that question authority and act in a positive way

#### [3] Learning philosophy is a unique benefit to LD which allows us to be exposed to certain modes of thought that would otherwise be concealed by normative education

#### [4] Denying debate is good is a double turn since [a] It is the activity through which you learned your position [b] It is where you attempt to spread your message [c] You are at a debate tournament which proves that you found some inherent value in the activity

#### Drop the Debater: I’m indicting their entire advocacy so anything else is incoherent.

#### Can’t weigh case – a. begs the question of you winning your model of debate – it’s a question of form vs. content b. engagement was skewed to begin with, so you have a lower threshold of justification

#### No RVIs: A. Logic – it’s their burden to be fair and anything else justifies getting a 100 for proving you didn’t cheat on a test B. Encourages baiting abuse and then winning theory off the scripted counterinterp.

#### No Impact Turns: A. I’m not forcing you to do anything – under a competing interps model of debate we decide which norm is best. B. T is an argument why the aff is a bad idea just like any indict we would read on case so it’s NUQ.

#### Neg gets new 2nr responses – I don’t know the implications of the aff until after the 1ar – 2nr responses otherwise they could get away with any new args.

## 2

#### Presumption negates 1. B/c infinite ways to disprove a statement false so o/w on probability 2. Met our burden because means we have denied the truth of the aff if it does not make any sense 3. Default assumption is saying something is false that’s why we don’t believe in conspiracy theories.

#### Permissibilty negates because resolution [implies](https://www.dictionary.com/browse/ought) a moral obligation, and permiss would deny an obligation

#### Any moral system faces the problem of regress – I can keep asking “why should I follow this.” Regress collapses to skep since no one can generate obligations absent grounds for accepting them. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” asks for a reason for reasons, which concedes its authority. And, reason must be universal – [A] a reason for one agent is a reason for another agent. I can’t say 2+2=4 is true for me but not for you [B] any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends i.e. if I want to eat ice cream, I must recognize that others may affect my pursuit of that end and demand the value of my end be recognized by others which acts as a side constraint on any fw.

#### Thus, counter-methodology: Vote negative to engage in a liberation strategy of universal reason. This entails a starting point where we abstract from individual perspectives to understand the universal, and use this starting point to apply it to empirical institutions and agents. No perms: Uniquely non-sensical in a method debate: a] It assumes a notion of fiat that doesn’t make sense without a plan. The 1AC role of the ballot forefronts the performative and methodological which a permutation steals away

#### Prefer:

#### Negate:

#### [1] Independently, Kant is incompatible with a your method – it requires unconditional respect for humanity as an end in itself.

Korsgaard 83 bracketed for gendered language (Christine M., “Two Distinctions in Goodness,” The Philosophical Review Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 169-195, JSTOR)

The argument shows how Kant's idea of justification works. It can be read as a kind of regress upon the conditions, starting from an important assumption. The assumption is that when a rational being makes a choice or undertakes an action, [they] he or she supposes the object to be good, and its pursuit to be justified. At least, if there is a categorical imperative there must be objectively good ends, for then there are necessary actions and so necessary ends (G 45-46/427-428 and Doctrine of Virtue 43-44/384-385). In order for there to be any objectively good ends, however, there must be something that is unconditionally good and so can serve as a sufficient condition of their goodness. Kant considers what this might be: it cannot be an object of inclination, for those have only a conditional worth, "for if the inclinations and the needs founded on them did not exist, their object would be without worth" (G 46/428). It cannot be the inclinations themselves because a rational being would rather be free from them. Nor can it be external things, which serve only as means. So, Kant asserts, the unconditionally valuable thing must be "humanity" or "rational nature," which he defines as "the power set to an end" (G 56/437 and DV 51/392). Kant explains that regarding your existence as a rational being as an end in itself is a "subjective principle of human action." By this I understand him to mean that we must regard ourselves as capable of conferring value upon the objects of our choice, the ends that we set, because we must regard our ends as good. But since "every other rational being thinks of his existence by the same rational ground which holds also for myself' (G 47/429), we must regard others as capable of conferring value by reason of their rational choices and so also as ends in themselves. Treating another as an end in itself thus involves making that person's ends as far as possible your own (G 49/430). The ends that are chosen by any rational being, possessed of the humanity or rational nature that is fully realized in a good will, take on the status of objective goods. They are not intrinsically valuable, but they are objectively valuable in the sense that every rational being has a reason to promote or realize them. For this reason it is our duty to promote the happiness of others-the ends that they choose-and, in general, to make the highest good our end.

#### [2] Independently not defending the topic is non-universalizable b/c if nobody defended the topic than a topic wouldn’t have even been created in the first place which is a contradiction in conception.

## Case