**1NC – T [Medicines]**

**Debaters may not specify that member nations ought to reduce protection on a subset of medicines**

**Nebel 19**Jake Nebel [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs.] , 8-12-2019, "Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution," Briefly, <https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/> SM

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions. Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window. So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why. 1.1 “Colleges and Universities” “Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons. First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural. Second, “colleges and universities” fails the upward-entailment test for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals. Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universities generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution. Fourth, it is extremely unlikely that the topic committee would have written the resolution with the existential interpretation of “colleges and universities” in mind. If they intended the existential interpretation, they would have added explicit existential quantifiers like “some.” No such addition would be necessary or expected for the generic interpretation since generics lack explicit quantifiers by default. The topic committee’s likely intentions are not decisive, but they strongly suggest that the generic interpretation is correct, since it’s prima facie unlikely that a committee charged with writing a sentence to be debated would be so badly mistaken about what their sentence means (which they would be if they intended the existential interpretation). The committee, moreover, does not write resolutions for the 0.1 percent of debaters who debate on the national circuit; they write resolutions, at least in large part, to be debated by the vast majority of students on the vast majority of circuits, who would take the resolution to be (pretty obviously, I’d imagine) generic with respect to “colleges and universities,” given its face-value meaning and standard expectations about what LD resolutions tend to mean.

**Applies to medicines”—[a] “nations should ban [1AC], therefore nations should IP protections” is invalid, [b] upward entailment: “nations should ban IP protections” doesn’t imply “nations ought ban all property protections” since maybe land titles are ok, [c] adverb test: adding “usually” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning.**

**Violation: they spec**

**[1] Semantics is an independent voter—[a] jurisdiction: you can’t vote aff if there isn’t an aff to vote on—they agreed to debate the topic since it was in the invitation, [b] it’s the only stasis point for prep, so it controls the internal link to engagement—anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words.**

**[2] Limits: there are limitless subsets of medicines they can specify, which incentivizes obscure affs that deck neg prep. Even if they say generics, they’ll just arbitrarily use the advocacy to exclude neg ground or pigeonhole the neg into the same strat and win every round. TVA solves—read your plan as advantages under a whole-res aff. Err neg—the topic is already so under-limited because there are 2 plurals to spec and vague definitions about medicines, so you should over-limit to ensure deep clash on a stable stasis point.**

**Fairness is a voter—debate’s incoherent without fairness since the only thing intrinsic to debate is that it's competitive.**

**No aff RVIs:**

**[a] They have infinite prep so they can frontline case and T and should be able to defend their practices.**

**[b] Logic: you don’t win for proving you are T—otherwise we would auto-vote aff when they read a topical plan.**

**Drop the aff Debater:**

**[a] They skewed the round from the start and the 2NR is too late for the neg to recover, which also means that my abuse is just compensation for their abuse.**

**[b] Logic: drop the arg would mean that they don’t have an advocacy.**

**Competing Interpretations:**

**[a] Reasonability is arbitrary—they’ll just pick a B/L that is the aff.**

**[b] Sets norms about the resolution since it gives a clear interpretation of the topic—otherwise the neg would have no idea what to prep against.**

**Allow new 2NR arguments on theory b/c the 1AR gets new theory args.**