## T

#### CI – affs may specify a reduction of IPP.

#### 1) I meet:

#### a) The plan defends a wholesale reduction of IPP on women’s medicine

#### 2) Silencing DA: cross apply Mike 1 – women face the brunt of the impact of patents so making the aff whole res pushes their struggles to the backburner – only the aff focuses on the real problem so we should get full education offense

#### 3) Functional Limits Check: I have a framework, inherency, and a solvency section

#### 4) Generics Check: Any K, Innovation, Counterfeits, etc. would still link to the aff – small affs risk losing to a ptx DA or the K

#### 5) Pragmatics Before Semantics:

#### a) education is the only exportable feature of round – if I prove my discussion is good that’s sufficient for my aff to be topical

#### b) there isn’t a jurisdiction ! – judges vote on non – T affs all the time

#### Use Reasonability with the b/l of link and impact turn ground – good is good enough and key to getting back to substance

#### Yes RVIs:

#### 1) A2 Chilling - The aff still has to go win offense to the counter-interp and justify their original position. This means only bad theory arguments are “chilled”, which is good because it forces negs to think twice before reading silly bi-directional interps. Controls the internal link to education offense – it would lead to us actually debating the topic.

#### 2) A2 Illogical - RVI’s say you should vote aff to punish neg for needlessly calling aff a cheater – it would be illogical to let them get away with this without any repercussion.

#### 3) Forces them to justify why T is good – Bad model of debate to be able to read something and immediately kick it, we’ll justify why our aff is good and you justify why T is good

#### [Leslie and Lerner 1] First, this shell conflates Bare Generic Principles with modifiers such as “all” or “often”.

**Leslie and Lerner 1:** Leslie, Sarah-Jane [Professor of Philosophy, Princeton University] and Adam Lerner [Postgraduate Research Associate, Philosophy, Princeton University] "Generic Generalizations." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Winter 2016. BW

As these examples illustrate, generics are not equivalent in meaning to any of the quantifying determiners such as “all”, “some”, or “most”. They also differ in meaning from sentences containing adverbs of quantification (Lewis 1975) such as “generally”, “usually”, or “often”. For example, the generic “books are paperbacks” is false, yet the insertion of any of these adverbs of quantification would render the statement true: “books are generally/usually/often paperbacks”.

The Resolution does not use the phrase “**all** medicines” allows for exceptions, such as specified in the AC.

## Util

#### [Overview] Util is a horrible calculus for women and the issues they face –

#### a) Abstraction DA - util will always aim to coopt suffering with silly extinction scenarios that have low probability - so even if a women is literally going to die because she can’t access medicine, it doesn’t matter because they’ll frame extinction as worse

b) **Homogenization of Pain DA** – util homogenizes the suffering women face in order to aggregate so the complexity of an issue is always going to be ignored – this is the same way doctors have ignored the pain women face for YEARS

#### Pain and Pleasure – this binary is awful – there’s so many more emotions that exist besides pain and pleasure (psychological violence, fear, etc. ) that are encompassed within the umbrella of oppression that this cannot account for so my framework will o/w on scope because it can encompass more

#### Extinction First – this rhetoric aims to coopt the issues women face so that policymakers NEVER have to deal with them, which is why they should have to win 100 percent probability that extinction is going to happen, otherwise default to my framework

#### The panic Utilitarianism insinuates is a form of masculine futurity which allows the endless sacrifice of reproductive freedom to be justified in the name of the “greatest good.”

Petersen 15: (Kristin Petersen B.A., University of Southern California 2003 M.A. New York University 2008, A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, The Logic of Futurity: Reproduction, Cultural Eugenics, and Contingencies of Women’s Citizenship in the Contemporary United States, Proquest, JK)

Cultural theorist Ruth McElroy suggests, “Women’s belonging to nations is indissoluble from their reproductive biology” (325). For all that motherhood may be conceived as a private choice occurring in the supposedly private sphere, reproduction and motherhood are nonetheless public and political as well, and thoroughly entangled with women’s status as members of their nation. By virtue of their reproduction (or even lack thereof!), women can be constructed in cultural narratives and political scripts as contributors to society or threats to the national good, caretakers of the future who merit protection and support or wayward parents who must be disciplined back into the national fold, national maternal ideals or outsiders within. The state’s identification of and response to women as reproducers reflects the continuous processes of the politics of belonging, which “involve not only the maintenance and reproduction of the boundaries of the community of belonging by the hegemonic political powers...but also by their contestation, challenge and resistance by other political agents” (Yuval-Davis 20). We see these politics of belonging manifested not only discursively, but also in the policies and laws that protect or privilege some mothers and not others, some children, but not all. When anthropologists Faye Ginsburg and Rayna Rapp ask, “who defines the body of the nation into which the next generation is recruited? Who is considered to be in that national body, who is out of it?” (3), therefore, there is no one answer; rather, this is the question perpetually being asked and answered by political discourse and practice infused with the logic of futurity. The hopes and fears of the present political moment and the imaginative desires for the future are thus continually projected upon the bodies of women and their procreative capacities. Futurity, I suggest in this project, as a possibly inevitable perspective or worldview, allows for the state to focus on women as reproductive beings in a way that it does not for men. Following from Foucault’s explication of biopower, the modern state takes an interest in the workings and ostensible health of its populations, creating new knowledges and indices for the normal as it counts up the characteristics of its citizenry and sets goals for demographic management. While Foucault tends not to focus on the reproductive elements of the state’s biopolitical interest—for instance, the setting of ideal rates of fertility, health expectations for women and children, creation of access to the medical, economic, and social resources needed for reproduction—these are, I would argue, operations of the state that have potential for tremendous impacts upon women particularly. The other biopolitical interests of the state—appropriate number of workers, manageable immigration rates, proper ratio of elderly to young, and so on—are also all implicated in the procreative behaviors of women, which would seem to intensify the state’s interest in them. Brought into the broader framework of women’s political status and national belonging, reproduction in this context seems poised to function as an axis upon which the dispensation of women’s citizenship can pivot, with particular regard to her racial, economic, and social demographic and the state’s assessment of her (and her children’s) value to the national future. Penelope Deutscher suggests that through the emergence of biopower: Women would later assume a status as a reproductive threshold of the future and health of nations, populations and peoples. But the condition for this role for women and maternal reproductivity was the very possibility of reproduction being associated with a shifting field of possible substances, telos, outcomes and obligations: the overall good, the general happiness, the future of the nation, the health of the nation, the competitiveness of the nation, the future of the people, individual flourishing or freedom, individual rights, domestic happiness, the family unit as building block of the nation, the transmission of the bloodline, the family name, transmission of property or family or genealogical transmission, reproduction of the labour force, etc. That reproduction be plausibly thought of in such terms at all was a precondition of it becoming associated with women’s role as threshold of futurity. (Deutscher 129) The state’s biopolitical management of women’s reproduction may thus allow it to approach women primarily as reproductive beings, an essentalist or even utilitarian collapse that may make it easier to intervene upon their bodies and perhaps reflects a deeply ingrained discomfort with the notion that women have tremendous potential power to impact the composition of the future. In this project, I am proposing a framework of futurity that is in operation, characterized by discursive and eugenic aspects, that uses women as the vehicle for future world-building and nation-making. This futurity aims to enact particular visions of the future via changes in the present, particularly through the management of women’s reproduction in the present such that the future population comports with present desires. When this futurity framework is picked up by the state in its various capacities, I suggest there are significant consequences for women’s citizenship as women because they are so intrinsically linked in the cultural and political imaginary with reproduction. In the process of grappling with these concepts, this project asks how the logic of futurity functions to organize the terms of women’s social or political belonging in reproductive terms. How does the state pick up and extend this logic to women, and how might that impact the meaningfulness of women’s citizenship or national belonging? Does the logic of futurity, the constant pressure of the forward vision combined with the imaginative limitations of the present, insist upon women’s citizenship being or becoming something fundamentally different from men’s by virtue of reproductive capacity and association? Exploring these questions brings this project into several disciplinary contexts, including feminist theory and philosophy, political theory, disability theory (eugenics), and even the sphere of economics. In connecting these concepts to ongoing conversations about women and citizenship in the contemporary United States, this project is ultimately working to tie together disparate fields and illuminate how they interact with respect to a model of futurity that I theorize as containing discursive and eugenic aspects. It may be that state-based discourses and practices related to women’s reproduction and citizenship are not so much causes as they are effects of the logic of futurity.

## DA

1. No link not speicifc to medicine
2. No impact

## CP

Doesn’t solve – card saying WHO would be thereated is from 2004 no credicbilty loss

2

#### 1] This is a form of male scholarship theft - mirrors things in academia like when Rosslyn Franklin came up with DNA being discovered she never got credit for her work bc it was stolen by men - a harm under my ROJ and ROB

#### 2] It is male authoritarism to say that I cant do my aff unless I consult men - I have to check in with a group of men before I can do the aff which is what’s going on in the status quo

#### 3] Force them to have specific evidence about The Who and WTO being necessary and reproductive rights - without that its another lack of equity in debate which is that I’m expected to come up with a well - researched aff but they dont need evidence for the cp

Perm do the aff then the neg