# 1NC

## 1

#### Interpretation – the Aff may not specify medicines.

#### Medicines is a generic bare plural

Nebel 20 [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Indefinite Singular Generics in Debate” Victory Briefs, 19 August 2020. no url AG

I agree that if “a democracy” in the resolution just meant “one or more democracy,” then a country-specific affirmative could be topical. But, as I will explain in this topic analysis, that isn’t what “a democracy” means in the resolution. To see why, we first need to back up a bit and review (or learn) the idea of generic generalizations.

The most common way of expressing a generic in English is through a *bare plural*. A bare plural is a plural noun phrase, like “dogs” and “cats,” that lacks an overt determiner. (A determiner is a word that tells us which or how many: determiners include quantifier words like “all,” “some,” and “most,” demonstratives like “this” and “those,” posses- sives like “mine” and “its,” and so on.) LD resolutions often contain bare plurals, and that is the most common clue to their genericity.

We have already seen some examples of generics that are not bare plurals: “A whale is a mammal,” “A beaver builds dams,” and “The woolly mammoth is extinct.” The first two examples use indefinite singulars—singular nouns preceded by the indefinite article “a”—and the third is a definite singular since it is preceded by the definite article “the.” Generics can also be expressed with bare singulars (“Syrup is viscous”) and even verbs (as we’ll see later on). The resolution’s “a democracy” is an indefinite singular, and so it very well might be—and, as we’ll soon see, is—generic.

But it is also important to keep in mind that, just as not all generics are bare plurals, not all bare plurals are generic. “Dogs are barking” is true as long as some dogs are barking. Bare plurals can be used in particular ways to express existential statements. The key question for any given debate resolution that contains a bare plural is whether that occurrence of the bare plural is generic or existential.

The same is true of indefinite singulars. As debaters will be quick to point out, some uses of the indefinite singular really do mean “some” or “one or more”: “A cat is on the mat” is clearly not a generic generalization about cats; it’s true as long as some cat is on the mat. The question is whether the indefinite singular “a democracy” is existential or generic in the resolution.

Now, my own view is that, if we understand the difference between existential and generic statements, and if we approach the question impartially, without any invest- ment in one side of the debate, we can almost always just tell which reading is correct just by thinking about it. It is clear that “In a democracy, voting ought to be compul- sory” doesn’t mean “There is one or more democracy in which voting ought to be com- pulsory.” I don’t think a fancy argument should be required to show this any more than a fancy argument should be required to show that “A duck doesn’t lay eggs” is a generic—a false one because ducks do lay eggs, even though some ducks (namely males) don’t. And if a debater contests this by insisting that “a democracy” is existen- tial, the judge should be willing to resolve competing claims by, well, judging—that is, by using her judgment. Contesting a claim by insisting on its negation or demanding justification doesn’t put any obligation on the judge to be neutral about it. (Otherwise the negative could make every debate irresolvable by just insisting on the negation of every statement in the affirmative speeches.) Even if the insistence is backed by some sort of argument, we can reasonably reject an argument if we know its conclusion to be false, even if we are not in a position to know exactly where the argument goes wrong. Particularly in matters of logic and language, speakers have more direct knowledge of particular cases (e.g., that some specific inference is invalid or some specific sentence is infelicitious) than of the underlying explanations.

But that is just my view, and not every judge agrees with me, so it will be helpful to consider some arguments for the conclusion that we already know to be true: that, even if the United States is a democracy and ought to have compulsory voting, that doesn’t suffice to show that, in a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory—in other words, that “a democracy” in the resolution is generic, not existential.

Second, existential uses of the indefinite, such as “A cat is on the mat,” are upward- entailing.3 This means that if you replace the noun with a more general one, such as “An animal is on the mat,” the sentence will still be true. So let’s do that with “a democracy.” Does the resolution entail “In a society, voting ought to be compulsory”? Intuitively not, because you could think that voting ought to be compulsory in democracies but not in other sorts of societies. This suggests that “a democracy” in the resolution is not existential.

#### It applies to this topic – democracy was the subject of SeptOct that year the same way medicines are the subject of SeptOct because “Member nations ought to eliminate IP for covid – therefore, member nations ought to eliminate IP protections for all” is illogical

#### 1] Limits: There’s inf medicines they could specify, coupled with various types of countries. Kills neg burdens – it’s impossible for me to research every possible combination of the 195 countries and medicines.

#### 2] TVA Solves – just read your aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff. We aren’t stopping them from reading new FWs, mechanisms, or advantages. PICs don’t solve – it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff making it impossible for me to win

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

#### No impact turns to T—T is a procedural that determines case’s validity and every argument says the aff is bad

## 2

#### The role of the ballot is to determine the truth or falsity of the resolution. Prefer:

#### 1] Text – five dictionaries define negate as to deny the truth of and affirms to prove true which means the only obligation of the judge is to vote on the resolution’s truth/falsity. Outweighs on commonality – it is abundantly clear that our roles are verified. Any other ROB enforces an external norm on debate, but only truth testing is intrinsic to the process of debate, i.e., proving statements true or false through argumentation. Constitutivism outweighs because you don’t have the jurisdiction to not test the truth of the resolution – if someone says you should break the rules of the game to have more fun ten you should ignore them as a competition only makes sense when it has rules.

#### 2] All other ROBs collapse – any property assumes the truth of the property, i.e., if I say, “the sky is blue” it is the same as me saying “it is true that the sky is blue”, which means they are also a question of truth claim’s because it’s intrinsic. It also means that their ROB warrants aren’t mutually exclusive with mine.

#### 3] Anything else moots 7 minutes of the 1NC and strengthens their pre-round prep since I need to be able to compensate by choosing my own offense.

#### 4] Resolvability – scalar methods like comparison between DAs and advantages increase judge intervention – truth testing solves because it’s a yes/no question of whether the resolution is logically true or not.

#### Now negate –

#### [1] Intellectual is defined as “possessing or showing intellect or mental compacity” (Dictionary.com) but property can’t possess intellect so the resolutions incoherent.

#### [2] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t logically going to happen.

#### [3] member means “a body part or organ” (Marriam Webster) but a nation cannot have bodily organs so the resolutions incoherent

#### [5] To means “indicate movement” (Merriam Webster), but that means the resolution is incoherent because the word ought cannot move to the word reduce. Means you negate on face because you can’t even know what the resolution looks like and an incoherent claim can’t have truth.

#### [6] Trade means “a publication intended for persons in the entertainment business”(Merriam Webster) but a world entertainment business cannot reduce intellectual property making the resolution incoherent.

#### [7] Medicine means “a spell, charm, or fetish believed to have healing (Oxford Languages)” so reducing intellectual property protections for spells is incoherent.

#### [8] Property means “a building” (Oxford Languages) so reducing intellectual buildings is incoherent

#### [9] Aff has an absolute burden of proof – any doubt means you negate since a claim not that claim can’t be true, so any risk of falsity is entirely false.

#### Permissibility and presumption negate –

#### 1] Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility and proving one disproves the other two. Semantics outweighs – A. it’s key to predictability since we prep based on the wording of the res B. It’s constitutive to the rules of debate since the judge is obligated to vote on the resolutional text.

#### 2] Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e., if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both “P” and “~P” are true

#### 3] Intuitions – A. We assume statements to be false until proven true. That is why we don’t believe in alternate realities or conspiracy theories; B. Statements are more often false than true because any part of the resolution could be false.

## 3

**A-Interpretation: The aff must individually number all arguments in the AC. They must have three separate sections in the AC: a section where they number all framework arguments, a section for all contention arguments, and a section for arguments that do not justify the framework or link back to the framework as a contention (i.e. for spikes). Each numbered argument must only contain one argument.**

**B-Violation:**

**They don’t number all arguments in the AC (specifically, they didn’t number…)**

**They don’t have separate sections for the framework, contention, and spikes.**

**They number arguments, but some arguments contain more than 1 arg**

**C-Standards:**

**Strat Skew – I can’t form a strategy because I first have to figure out where the arguments are before I can determine what the args actually mean. Numbering and having sections is always comparatively better because then I know exactly how many arguments there are, and it becomes clear which one’s I have to respond to. Otherwise, I have to waste time figuring out where each argument is and what they justify. Strategy is key to fairness because it’s key to forming a ballot story. This also links to education because no critical thinking occurs if I am unable to respond to their args since I can’t find them.**

## Case

#### 1] Util can’t guide action because it never has consistent rules – morality constantly changes based on each situation’s specific benefits. Without tangible rules to tell people how to be moral, they don’t know how to act.

#### 2] There’s always infinite pleasure and pain in the universe—util is incoherent since we can’t add or subtract from that

**Bostrom ’08** (Bostrom, Nick [Professor at University of Oxford, director of Oxford’s Future of Humanity Institute, PhD from London School of Economics]. The Infinitarian Challenge to Aggregative Ethics. 2008. http://www.nickbostrom.com/ethics/infinite.pdf)

In the standard Big Bang model, assuming the simplest topology (i.e., that space is singly connected), there are three basic possibilities: the universe can be open, flat, or closed. **Current data suggests a flat or open universe**, although the final verdict is pending. **If the universe is either open or flat, then it [that] is spatially infinite at every point in time and the model entails that it contains an infinite number of galaxies, stars, and planets**. There exists a common misconception which confuses the universe with the (finite) ‘observable universe’. But **the observable part**—the part that coulsd causally affect us—**would be just an infinitesimal fraction of the whole**. Statements about the “mass of the universe” or the “number of protons in the universe” generally refer to the content of this observable part; see e.g. [1]. **Many cosmologists [also] believe that our universe is just one in an infinite ensemble of universes** (a multiverse), **and this adds to the probability that the world is canonically infinite**; for a popular review, see

#### 3] Predictions are impossible – any action could theoretically cause nuke war in 10 billion years

#### A] There’s no non-arbitrary cutoff to calculations since ethics shouldn’t be, but even if there were, finite possibility of infinite extinction impacts on each side make expected utility equal.

#### B] Util Can’t guide action: it requires constantly calculating to determine the maximally productive time to make an action.

#### 4] Justifying predictions is circular – there’s no reason trends continue, which means they’re justified by experience, but that relies on extrapolating trends.

#### 5] Aggregation impossible – Multiple chemicals in the brain make me happy. So, there’s no way to compare them. Or determine which ones to maximize.

#### 6] Calculative regress: util requires we calculate how much time to spend on our calculations, then how much time to spend on those calculations to infinity, freezing action which means we can never do anything since we’re always calculating the time to calculate.

#### The aff is non-unique. Drug prices for HIV meds are already decreasing massively in the squo and innovation has been key to these medicines.

**Unitaid 20** [75% The, 12-01-20, "Groundbreaking Agreement Reduces by 75% the Cost of HIV Treatment for Children in Low-and Middle-Income Countries," Unitaid, <https://unitaid.org/news-blog/groundbreaking-agreement-reduces-by-75-the-cost-of-hiv-treatment-for-children-in-low-and-middle-income-countries/#en>] //DD PT

New formulation is dispersible and strawberry-flavoured, enabling the youngest children living with HIV to be treated with the best available medication

New price agreement with Viatris and Macleods will significantly lower cost for yearly paediatric HIV treatment from over $480 per child to under $120 per child[[1]](https://unitaid.org/news-blog/groundbreaking-agreement-reduces-by-75-the-cost-of-hiv-treatment-for-children-in-low-and-middle-income-countries/" \l "_ftn1)

Innovative partnership has accelerated development of first generic paediatric dispersible formulation of dolutegravir (DTG), the recommended first-line HIV treatment

A long-awaited HIV treatment designed specifically for children will now be available in low-and middle-income countries, thanks to a landmark agreement from Unitaid and the [Clinton Health Access Initiative](https://www.clintonhealthaccess.org/) (CHAI).

1.7 million children around the world live with HIV, but only half of them receive any treatment and 100,000 die every year. For many of these children, the HIV virus is not suppressed, due in part to the lack of availability of effective drugs that are palatable and properly adapted for them.

The new pricing agreement with generic manufacturers Viatris and Macleods means a new dispersible formulation of the recommended first-line HIV treatment dolutegravir (DTG) will be launched at a yearly cost of $36 per child, reduced from around $400[[2]](https://unitaid.org/news-blog/groundbreaking-agreement-reduces-by-75-the-cost-of-hiv-treatment-for-children-in-low-and-middle-income-countries/" \l "_ftn2).

The innovative partnership between Unitaid, CHAI and ViiV Healthcare[[3]](https://unitaid.org/news-blog/groundbreaking-agreement-reduces-by-75-the-cost-of-hiv-treatment-for-children-in-low-and-middle-income-countries/" \l "_ftn3), together with Mylan (now a subsidiary of Viatris), has resulted in the fastest ever regulatory approval under the US FDA PEPFAR programme of a generic paediatric HIV drug.

#### There is a fundamental issue in the drug practices and markets in poor countries – patented drugs are not the problem

**Silverman et al 19**[Rachel Silverman is a policy fellow at the Center for Global Development, where she leads policy-oriented research on global health financing and incentive structures. Janeen Madan Keller is a senior policy analyst and assistant director of global health at the Center for Global Development. Amanda Glassman is executive vice president and senior fellow at the Center for Global Development and also serves as chief executive officer of CGD Europe. Kalipso Chalkidou is the Director of Global Health Policy and a Senior Fellow at the Center for Global Development, Center for Global Development, “New Study Finds Some Poor Countries Paying 20 to 30 Times More for Basic Medicines Than Others”, June 17. 2019, <https://www.cgdev.org/article/new-study-finds-some-poor-countries-paying-20-30-times-more-basic-medicines-others>] DD MN

WASHINGTON – **Basic,** **everyday drugs can cost up to 20 to 30 times more in some poor countries** than others, **according to a new study released today by the Center for Global Development. The study examined billions of dollars of health spending on common, life-saving medicines in developing countries, mostly in Africa and Asia.** To date, it is one of the largest-ever studies on global health procurement. “Developing countries are often paying far more for everyday drugs than they should be. Why do some poor countries pay 20 to 30 times as much as others for common medicines to relieve pain or treat hypertension? In large part, **because of flawed drug buying practices and broken generic medicines markets**,” said Amanda Glassman, one of the authors of the study and the executive vice president at the Center for Global Development. “A robust market for generic drugs is a core part of an affordable health system. But in way too many countries, generic drug markets are broken and patients are paying the price,” said Kalipso Chalkidou, the director of global health policy at the Center for Global Development and an author of the study. “You need enough competition to keep prices low and quality assurance that consumers trust, or essential medicines are going to be much more expensive than they should be.” The study had three main findings: **In developing countries, prices for basic generic medicines can** vary widely and **far exceed wealthy-country prices**. Some purchasers in low- and middle-income countries pay as much as 20 to 30 times more for basic generic medicines like omeprazole, used to treat heartburn, or acetaminophen (also known as paracetamol), a common pain reliever. **Low- and middle-income countries purchase more expensive branded generic drugs rather than unbranded quality-assured generics**. In the US, most drugs are either on-patent medicines or unbranded generics, but in many developing countries more expensive brand-name generics are widely used, because people are concerned about unsafe or counterfeit drugs. **In the poorest countries, unbranded generics are only 5 percent of the pharma**ceutical **market** by volume—**in comparison to the US where unbranded** quality-assured **generics are 85 percent of the market** by volume. **There is little competition in the supply of** essential medicines in low- and middle-income countries. The largest seller of products like contraceptives, cancer medicines, and antiparasitics can account for upwards of 85 percent of all sales in some countries. “We’re talking about access to **common medications for pain or high blood pressure, not the latest cutting-edge cancer drugs**,” Glassman said. “It’s not as exciting to talk about procurement as new health technologies or biotech breakthroughs,” she continued. “But drug purchasing is incredibly important, and if it’s done badly you end up with the poorest countries in the world paying some of the highest drug prices.”