### 1

#### Interpretation & Violation: The affirmative debater must specify the type of medicine they defend in a delineated text in the 1AC – they didn’t

#### Medicine is the core question of the topic and there’s no consensus on normal means so you must spec.

**Hofmann 21:** Hofmann, Bjorn [Institute for the Health Sciences at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) at Gjøvik, PO Box 1, 2802, Gjøvik, Norway] “Vagueness in Medicine: On Disciplinary Indistinctness, Fuzzy Phenomena, Vague Concepts, Uncertain Knowledge, and Fact-Value-Interaction” *Springer Link,* July 05, 2021 AA <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10516-021-09573-4>

This article investigates five kinds of vagueness in medicine: disciplinary, ontological, conceptual, epistemic, and vagueness with respect to descriptive-prescriptive connections. **First, medicine is a discipline with unclear borders, as it builds on a wide range of other disciplines and subjects. Second, medicine deals with many indistinct phenomena resulting in borderline cases. Third, medicine uses a variety of vague concepts, making it unclear which situations, conditions, and processes that fall under them. Fourth, medicine is based on and produces uncertain knowledge and evidence. Fifth, vagueness emerges in medicine as a result of a wide range of fact-value-interactions. The various kinds of vagueness in medicine can explain many of the basic challenges of modern medicine, such as overdiagnosis, underdiagnosis, and medicalization.** Even more, it illustrates how complex and challenging the field of medicine is, but also how important contributions from the philosophy can be for the practice of medicine. **By clarifying** and, where possible, **reducing or limiting vagueness, philosophy can help improving care. Reducing the various types of vagueness can improve clinical decision-making, informing individuals, and health policy making.**

#### 1] Stable Advocacy: 1AR clarification delinks neg positions that prove why specific medicines are bad by saying it isn’t a medicine they defend– wrecks neg ballot access and kills in depth clash – CX doesn’t check since it kills 1NC construction pre-round.

#### 2] Prep Skew: I don’t know what they will be willing to clarify until CX which means I could go 6 minutes planning to read a disad and then get screwed over in CX. This means that CX can’t check Key fairness because I won’t be able to use the strat I formulated if you skewed my prep and will have a time disadvantage.

#### Use competing interps – topicality is question of models of debate which they should have to proactively justify, and we’ll win reasonability links to our offense.

#### Drop the debater - dropping the arg is severance which moots 7 minutes of 1nc offense.

#### 3 – no rvis – a) incentivizes theory baiting, b) detracts from substantive debates, c) it’s illogical because your expected to be topical/fair. d) chilling people from reading theory – no impact turns, rvis and impact turns are the same thing, independent reasons to drop a team for reading team. It’s not policing it’s a question of your form not content and im a poc

### 2

#### Interpretation - the affirmative can only garner offense from the hypothetical implementation of their plan text. To clarify they shouldn’t have the option to garner prefiat offense

#### Resolved means a legislative policy

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### "Resolved" requires a policy.

Merriam Webster '18 (Merriam Webster; 2018 Edition; Online dictionary and legal resource; Merriam Webster, "resolve," <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resolve;> RP)  
: a legal or official determination especially: a legislative declaration

#### Violation- they garner offense from pre fiat measures not solely the implementation of the plan

#### A] Clash, the resolution serves as a predictable stasis point to enhance accessible research and equitable ground, but obfuscating that limit makes negative preparation impossible - defining a role for negation is essential to sustaining competition and comes before any affirmative offense---the impact is debatability, reading pre fiat offense is extra topical at best

#### B] Limits — pre fiat unpredictable offense lets them defend any method exploding limits, which erases neg ground and renders research burdens untenable, DAs, PICs, CPs, that are all intuitive points of research are null and void since their offense will OW, our interp link turns creativity by allowing both sides to predict arguments, research deficits, and clash

### 3

#### [ROB & Torres] The role of the ballot is to endorse the best anti-racist resistance strategy. This entails rejecting structures of whiteness to endorse better strategies for confronting racism

**Torres 2020** (Christina Torres, July 30 2020, “All Students Need Anti-racism Education,” Teaching Tolerance, <https://www.tolerance.org/magazine/all-students-need-antiracism-education> | Author quals -- Christina Torres is an English teacher at Punahou School in Honolulu, Hawai‘i. A graduate of the University of Southern California and Loyola Marymount University, she previously taught for two years in Los Angeles.) //neth

As more and more teachers, administrators, schools and organizations are questioning their practices and looking at the racist history of their institutions, many are finally asking, “How we can listen to and support Black students, teachers and communities who have been systemically silenced for too long?” This question is essential, and examining anti-Blackness in our practice is something we all must be looking at. Looking at anti-Blackness or inequities brought about by systems rooted in white supremacy and racism is something all students should be doing. While more institutions, including primarily or historically white ones, are committing to this work, white teachers with primarily white students can feel hesitant to discuss these issues since they may not feel it affects them. This idea is a fundamental misunderstanding of what anti-racist work actually is. Anti-racist work means acknowledging that racist beliefs and structures are pervasive in all aspects of our lives—from education to housing to climate change—and then actively doing work to tear down those beliefs and structures. Those beliefs and structures don’t just exist in primarily white/and or privileged institutions—they thrive there. Schools that house mostly students and teachers who have benefited from white privilege can lack the perspective to push back on institutional malpractice or racist mindsets that may be present. In addition, it is difficult to convince those with power and privilege to give those privileges up without clear education and work to understand why doing so is a necessity for true justice in our society. Doing the work in spaces of privilege may look different, but educators cannot pretend that anti-racist work doesn’t exist simply because their student body isn’t directly harmed by racism. There are clear aims that primarily white and otherwise privileged institutions must work toward in the fight against racism. Teachers must re-evaluate their curriculum. When teaching standards and core curricula have been developed for your students, it’s easy to simply follow along. However, it’s important to remember that our education system has been founded on historically racist practices, including silencing those from disenfranchised communities. It’s not just BIPOC who need to see themselves in the literature or history they study. White students need to hear those perspectives as well, just as straight and cisgender students need to read LGBTQ+ stories. This is because students need not just mirrors but also windows into other cultures, as Dr. Rudine Sims Bishop notes in her essay “Mirrors, Windows and Sliding Glass Doors.” Students from communities with white privilege need to hear voices from other perspectives in order to grow their own thinking. Those perspectives need to be diverse and empowering as well—only showing Black suffering or slavery does not begin to break down problematic beliefs about Black people. Instead, students coming from positions of power need to see and understand the power and agency of those who have been historically disenfranchised, particularly since society frequently tells them otherwise. This will allow white students and teachers to have a more accurate and nuanced understanding of our history, while also ensuring they can center BIPOC voices and be allies and accomplices instead of “saviors.” Students need to understand privilege and rethink power. Students from privileged communities can struggle to understand privilege since they may feel that they have had to work hard or struggle at times in their lives. Teachers must help students understand how privilege works at a systemic level that may have given students an edge that, while it may be one they didn’t ask for, is still very real. The work does not stop there, though. It can be easy in teaching privilege to fall into the trap of “white guilt” or “privilege guilt” (or even “survivor guilt” for BIPOC who have moved up socioeconomically and have internalized the belief that their communities were something to be “survived”). While guilt can be an important emotion to notice and process, educators should help students move through it to a place of action. Beyond “feeling bad” about generations of oppression, how can they use this knowledge to advocate for change and begin breaking down their own racist beliefs? How can they also reframe their understandings of privilege so that they stop prioritizing hegemonic ideas of success and worth? Some of that will mean teaching students to analyze and reframe how they see values and stories from other cultures. Most of us were taught to praise white-dominant cultural ideas: financial success, rugged individualism, paternalism. Because of this, cultures with different priorities may not be seen as “successful” or “valuable” in our eyes and in the eyes of our students. We need to teach students with privilege not to be “saviors” for historically disenfranchised communities, but rather to listen to, value and stand in kinship with them so we can work together toward justice. Schools must interrogate their practices and how they gained institutional privilege to begin with. Anti-racist work cannot be done on an individual or classroom level. Administrators, faculty and staff at primarily white or otherwise privileged institutions must question how this has affected their school, students and community. If you don’t have any Black students, why is that? If your school primarily serves folks with high socioeconomic status, what policies and events led to that? Schools need to consider how they can help create more integration in their community by having open and honest discussions with their parents and caregivers about the benefits of diverse schools (including for white students) or questioning policies (such as requirements regarding tardiness and truancy and dress codes) that have made it historically difficult for more diverse populations to join their school community. This also means making students from historically disenfranchised communities feel included when they do attend school. It’s not enough to simply have representation—students must feel that their identities are validated and that their school is a place that accepts them completely. In addition, schools must hold educators and students accountable when they say and do things that make school unsafe for those they claim they want to support. Only when students feel they will be supported by their schools will they be able to fully become a part of that school community. As Dr. Ibram X. Kendi notes in his work How to Be an Antiracist, “There is no neutrality in the racism struggle. ... The claim of ‘not racist’ neutrality is a mask for racism. ... An antiracist is someone who is supporting an antiracist policy by their actions or expressing an antiracist idea.”

#### 1 – they assume that one performance in the debate space will resolve the harms of the WTO on marginalized nation – white saviorism – assuming that your ivory tower discussions solve. Don’t let them no-link – they read the reid-brinkley card which is SPECIFICALLY about performance in the debate space

#### 2 – they assume racism and anti-Blackness are the same thing – that’s their Bledsoe & wright ev – it’s tagged to be abt racism but it’s SPECIFICALLY abt anti – Black violence – this is a colonizing move that attempts to erase specific experiences of violence

#### 3 – they advocate for reformism of a system that THEY ADMIT disenfranchises Black and Brown communities

#### [Fukuda] The WTO upholds four of the five pillars of capitalist imperialism

**Fukuda 2010** (Yasuo Fukuda, January 2010, “WTO REGIME AS A NEW STAGE OF IMPERIALISM: DECAYING CAPITALISM AND ITS ALTERNATIVE,” World Review of Political Economy, <https://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/hermes/ir/re/22161/0101106701.pdf>) //neth

Studies on imperialism can be traced back to J. A. Hobson (1902) and R. Hilferding (1909). Based on their works, Lenin (1917) characterized imperialism as a regime of governance by monopoly capital, concluding that imperialism is a decaying stage of capitalism. Lenin outlined [by] five pillars by which to define imperialism. The first is monopoly capital gaining control of the major industries of a country. The growth of monopoly capital is a consequence of market concentration caused by competition among firms. Once market concentration reaches a certain point, it becomes possible for a small number of winners to form collusions, such as cartels, which transform the nature of the economy, leading to the dominance of monopoly capital. The second pillar is the formation of business relationships between industrial and financial monopoly capital. Monopoly capital also forms cozy relationships with government through the financing of political campaigns and through revolving doors. In short, monopoly capital wields governing power over national economies through market concentration, collusions among large firms, and direct political influence. The third pillar is foreign investment. Drawing on its political influence, monopoly capital effects the transfer of wealth from workers, farmers, small to medium-sized businesses, and the self-employed to monopoly capital. The resulting distortion of income distribution causes disproportionate growth among industries—especially between manufacturing and farming—and suppresses consumption. This leads to over-accumulation, which forces monopoly capital to export merchandise and invest abroad. The fourth pillar is global divisions among monopoly capital through cartels. These divisions occur in the same way as those which take place at the national level; competition among large firms, and the market concentration which follows, leads to the formation of global cartel agreements. The fifth pillar is colonization of less-developed countries by the Great Powers, operating at the behest of monopoly capital. Such colonization is an outcome of global competition among opposing elements of monopoly capital. Monopoly capital takes advantage of colonization to monopolize control of natural resources and export markets, and as a means to protect capital invested in less-developed countries against appropriation. Figure 1 shows how the five pillars are related. The figure starts with monopoly capital as governing powers, from which follows a causal relationship down to the last outcome, competition for colonization. In other words, colonization is the final outcome of the governing power of monopoly capital. This is why Lenin considered monopoly capital to be the key to imperialism.1 monopoly capital as governing power ↓ distorted income distribution and unbalanced growth ↓ accumulation of redundant capital ↓ merchandise export and foreign investments ↓ global competition and global collusion ↓ struggles for colonization Figure 1 Lenin’s “Imperialism” Looking at contemporary capitalism from the viewpoint of Lenin’s “Imperialism,” it is clear that four of the five pillars (excepting the fifth) are still applicable to capitalism under the WTO regime. First, a small number of multinational corporations typically control more than half the market-share of major industries. For example, in the commercial seed market, the world’s top three corporations (Monsanto, DuPont, and Syngenta of Switzerland) control almost half of the world market. Cargill, along with its top four competitors, handle 85 percent of world grain trade. In the pharmaceutical industry, the top ten corporations hold a combined 54.8 percent share of the world market (ETC Group 2008). In banking, the world’s top 45 banks account for nearly 40 percent of the gross tier 1 capital of the top 1,000, and about 45 percent of the total assets (The Banker, June 24, 2009). It hardly needs saying that these companies enhance their power considerably through close relationships with governments, and through political contributions, lobbying, revolving doors, and the like.

#### [Fukuda] The WTO’s brand of capitalist imperialism is creating a rich vs poor divide

**Fukuda 2010** (Yasuo Fukuda, January 2010, “WTO REGIME AS A NEW STAGE OF IMPERIALISM: DECAYING CAPITALISM AND ITS ALTERNATIVE,” World Review of Political Economy, <https://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/hermes/ir/re/22161/0101106701.pdf>) //neth

The WTO regime was devised under the initiatives of monopoly capital as a means

to promote corporate globalization. The next task is to explore what corporate

globalization has brought to society. The true nature of corporate globalization is

expressed in its outcomes. Lenin characterized imperialism as a decaying stage of capitalism, owing to its unproductive character, which he described as rentier capitalism. The aim of this section is to show that corporate globalization too is nothing more than a decaying stage of capitalism. Over the past three decades, multinational corporations have drastically increased their shares of foreign investment and have greatly expanded their activities in the global marketplace. UNCTAD publishes the Trans-Nationality Index (TNI), which is a composite of three ratios: (foreign assets)/(total assets), (foreign sales)/(total sales), and (foreign employment)/(total employment). The TNI for the world’s top 100 companies increased from 47.0 percent in 1993 to 55.8 percent in 2003, an increase of 8.8 percent (UNCTAD 2007). The top 200 companies increased their share of total assets by 655.9 percent between 1983 and 2002, while the world GDP increased by just 179.5 percent over the same period (Anderson et al. 2005). This gap between the growth rates of corporate assets and GDP shows a considerable income shift from wages to profits. This rise in profits against wages has advanced considerably in the course of globalization (Ellwood 2001). Turning to the issue of standards of living in local communities, here the bleak side of corporate globalization is on full display. Corporate globalization has created a divided society, distinguished by rising levels of poverty among those at the lower end of the economic spectrum. In the US, which is the most unequal society among the OECD, the Gini coefficient (which measures household income inequality) has risen almost constantly since the late 1960s. Presently, the top 20 percent of US households possess 47.3 percent of total household income (2007) and 84.7 percent of net assets (2004) (Wolff 2001; Mishel et al. 2008/2009). This level of inequality is the result of considerable income gaps between capital and labor; management and the rank-and-file; standard and non-standard forms of employment; and large companies and subcontractors. It is the activities of monopoly capital which have caused the widening of these gaps. Moreover, multinational corporations have developed so-called downsizing policies, replacing standard employees with their non-standard counterparts. Such downsizing has drastically changed the make-up of society. These changes have transformed what was once basically a cooperative society into one which is markedly divided. Furthermore, this policy of downsizing is itself the result of corporate globalization in two key ways. One is a shift in the power balance toward multinational corporations; the other is the intensification of global competition among multinationals. Large multinational firms benefit from a wide range of selection-capacity in deciding where to locate facilities, including the ability to outsource production abroad. On the other hand, it is very difficult for workers to cross national borders in search of better employment opportunities; workers must seek jobs within their respective region. This difference in the flexibility of capital against labor gives capital the upper hand in regards to negotiated labor contracts. Deregulation of labor markets further advantages management over labor. Therefore, neo-liberal policies in the labor market affect the power balance between management and labor in just the same way as a collapse of trade unions. For just the same logic as in the labor market, the power balance has undergone a steady shift toward monopoly capital and away from small to medium-sized firms. Corporate globalization has also widened the per capita income gap between the north and the south, exacerbating the south’s poverty. While the number of people living on less than $1.25 per day decreased between 1981 and 2005, the number of people living on less than $2 per day rose considerably over the same period. After the collapse of the housing bubble in 2008, around 1 billion people now face chronic hunger and starvation. Poverty in developing countries often has a historical context, such as estate ownership or civil war. Still, neo-liberal policies have made it much more difficult for developing countries to address issues of poverty within their borders (Oxfam 2002; UNCTAD 2004: 189).

#### [Alt & Fukuda] The alternative is earth democracy – a shift away from capitalist globalization and a focus on sovereignty

**Fukuda 2010** (Yasuo Fukuda, January 2010, “WTO REGIME AS A NEW STAGE OF IMPERIALISM: DECAYING CAPITALISM AND ITS ALTERNATIVE,” World Review of Political Economy, <https://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/hermes/ir/re/22161/0101106701.pdf>) //neth

There is considerable ongoing debate between “globaphobes” and “globaphiles.” The decaying nature of modern capitalism shows that free trade is not a panacea for citizen welfare. The task of this section is not however to recount the arguments between globaphobes and globaphiles. Rather, the aim is to outline an alternative system. The matter at hand is how to restore viability, independence, and sustainability to local communities. But before arguing how this may be achieved, it is worthwhile to clarify the social conditions necessary for realizing such an outcome. V. Shiva (2005: Ch. 2) advocates “earth democracy” as an alternative to corporate globalization. Earth democracy is composed of four basic principles of sustainable society. The first is “ecological sustainability.” That is, the recognition that all species have intrinsic worth and that their life-cycles are interdependent of one another. The second is “community control of the commons.” Resources vital to sustenance, including public services and infrastructure, should not be privately owned; public resources must remain in the commons. The third is “security of livelihoods.” That is, the idea that all people have the right to basic needs, such as food, water, housing, and jobs. The fourth is “local sovereignty,” which amounts to community self-governance in regards to local economic affairs. Localization of the economy does not mean a closed economy; rather, it is the idea that local production should have priority over trade. These four principles are necessary conditions for sound and sustainable community life. The second principle, community control of the commons, and the fourth, local sovereignty, are necessary conditions for the third, security of livelihoods. The first principle, ecological sustainability, guarantees preservation of the environment, thereby protecting sustainability of livelihoods as well. These principles are not just the necessary conditions for sustainable society (Cavanach and Mander 2004), they are also the policy guidelines for realizing it (Korten 2001). It is a requirement of earth democracy that corporate globalization be dismantled. This is because corporate globalization denies all of the principles of earth democracy. Therefore, the power structure of corporate globalization must be broken up. First, the Anti-Trust Act must be reformed so that governments can mitigate the power of large firms in the global marketplace. Large companies that have no technical reason for maintaining such large organizations should be broken up into more governable segments. Second, market rules such as WTO agreements, should be rewritten. Introduced in the name of deregulation and trade liberalization, the aim of these rules has been nothing other than to allow large companies to use monopolistic power to control the global marketplace. Local governments must take back the right to formulate policy on matters affecting their own communities, reclaiming the policy space which has been hijacked by the WTO, the IMF, and the World Bank. Third, the ability of corporate power to design market systems must be checked. The political power of big business is principally based on cozy relationships with government. Therefore, political contributions from corporations must be prohibited, lobbying tied to political money should not be allowed, and revolving doors between big business and government must be closed (Marx et al. 2007). Finally, corporations should be deprived of the entitlement to express their political opinions through media, think tanks, etc. Simultaneous to the dismantling of the excesses of corporate power, it is also necessary that communities regain their independence on matters of economic policy. The arguments presented below are intended to itemize the policy tasks needed for the rebuilding of community-based society. The first task is to strengthen the foundations of the local economy. Here, the policy matter is how to secure productive investment in local communities. Local governments need to protect and support their home firms by adopting policies such as local contents regulations, and reinvestment rules in regards to profits gained locally. The second task is to support and nurture local businesses, such as small to medium-sized firms, the self-employed, family farming, and so forth, as these represent core elements of the local economy. The priority of industrial policies must be to shift power from big business to these local actors. The objective of such a policy shift should be to strengthen reproductive circulation within the local economy. Local actors are interdependent on one another through the internal circulations which occur at the local level. Therefore, the strengthening of local actors leads to the independence of the local economy. But this policy does not amount to locally closed economies (autarky). To the contrary, it is essential that local industries establish linkages with external markets to ensure viability of the local economy. What is important here is for local actors to take the initiative in establishing these linkages. Therefore, large firms need to be regulated so as to prevent them from damaging the interests of local economic actors. Large companies should be made to support local actors rather than inhibit them. The third task is for local communities to regain control of the commons. The commons, including natural resources (water, soil, seeds, gene information), public services and utilities (municipal water supplies, electric power sources, educational services, medical care), are indispensable to peoples’ lives. It is thus a prerequisite to the establishment of economic independence that local communities retain their policy space on issues which concern the commons. Even in cases of private ownership, local communities should have the final say with respect to governance of the commons. In addition, it should be strongly encouraged for citizens to develop a stake in the local economy through, for example, promotion of the co-ownership of cooperatives and the establishment of municipal holding companies. Localization is a way for people to realize democracy on a higher level. Upon this new dimension of democracy, local citizens can make strides toward more healthy and sustainable lives.

## Case

### Prefiat

#### 1nc args on prefiat - explodes limits of debate, kills predictability, our interpretation of prefiat doesn't matter, shifts goal post you can go for numerous forms of prefiat offense, judge intervention, moots neg ground you cant have topic da's to this which hurts small schools.

### Fw

#### 1 – they don’t have a ROB or ROJ text – the cards just have tags but they don’t tell you how to frame impacts – don’t let them recontextualize them as a different framing mechanism in the 1ar and 2ar – my strat was predicated on the text of the aff. this means you should default to our ROB

#### 2 – the Reid-Brinkley card CONCEDES that they don’t get prefiat offense b/c she specifically says that debate discussions DON’T spill over into real world change – means that we should evaluate who has the best method in the context of debate, not in the context of prefiat/performative offense

#### 3 – disad to their fw – they are a non Black person and they are making claims about the value/lack of value of Black life – that’s in the Bledsoe & Wright ev – independent reason to reject the team – they set a norm for white debaters being able to speak over Black voices

### Part 2

**They can’t solve most of their harms bc cap as a system still exists post aff and contributes to alt issues like skill disparities, lack of resources, the production system which are at the heart of the problem.**

#### Can never solve for cap – means ur impacts are nonunique

### Part 3 / plan

#### Overview to their solvency –

#### 1 – their solvency model is a waiver SPECIFICALLY for covid related medications – don’t let them garner offense from anything else

#### 2 – only garnering solvency for covid medications means that the aff doesn’t solve for their impacts – they talk about racial cap in the context of ALL medications, not just covid

#### 3 – they garner offense from monopolies – aff doesn’t solve that – WTO still props up monopoly capital and patents are granted for intermediary medications instead

#### 4 – MASSIVE alt causes – resource disparities, lack of infrastructure, lack of skill development,