## 1

#### A. Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than “The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines” then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy.

#### B. Violation:

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Fairness –

#### a) Ground –

#### b) Limits –

#### 2. Research –

## 2

#### Use a truth testing paradigm a) Logic –– b) Fiat is illusory –– c) ROBs that aren’t phrased as binaries maximize leeway for interpretation– d) Inclusion –– e) Permissibility trigger –– f) Constitutivism –– g) Inescapability –

## 3

#### Every reason is equally as violent in its creation.

**Derrida,** Jacques Derrida, “Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority” //Massa But **justice,** however unpresentable it may be, doesn't wait.· It **is that which must not wait.** To be direct, simple and brief, let us say this: **a just decision is always required immediately, "right away." It cannot furnish itself with** infinite information and the **unlimited knowledge of conditions,** rules or hypothetical imperatives **that could justify it.** And **even if it did** have all that at its disposal, even if it did give itself the time, all the time and all the necessary facts about the matter, **the moment of decision,** as such, **always remains a finite moment of urgency** and precipitation, since it must not be the consequence or the effectof this theoretical or historical knowledge, of this reflection or this deliberation, **since it always marks the interruption of the** juridico- or ethico- or politico-**cognitive deliberation that precedes it,** that must precede it. The instant of decision is a madness, says Kierkegaard. This is particularly true of the instant of the just decision that must rend time and defy dialectics. It is a madness. **Even if time** and prudence,the patience of knowledge and the mastery of conditions **were** hypothetically **unlimited, the decision would be structurally finite,** however late it came, decision of urgency and precipitation, **acting in** the night of **non-knowledge and non-rule**

#### Affirming negates.

**Paraphrasing Mcnamara ‘06**, Paul, 2-7-2006, "Deontic Logic (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," No Publication, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-deontic/index.html#4.3> //Massa

#### Premise 1—

#### Premise 2—

#### Thus, premise 3—

#### Skep is true

**Neta**, Ram. “External World Skepticism.” The Problem of The External World, **2014**, philosophy.unc.edu/files/2014/06/The-Problem-of-the-External-World.pdf. //Massa

You take yourself to know that you have hands. But notice that, **if you do have hands, then you are not merely a brain floating in a vat of nutrient fluid and being electrochemically stimulated to have the sensory experiences** that you have now: such a brain does not have hands, but you do. So if you know that you do have hands, then you must also be in a position to know that you are not such a brain. **But how could you know that you are not such a brain? If you were such a brain, everything would seem exactly as it does now**; **you would** (by hypothesis) **have all the same sensory experiences that you’re having right now.** Since your **empirical knowledge of the world** around you **must somehow be based upon your sensory experiences, how could these experiences**—the very same experiences that you would have if you were a brain in a vat—**furnish you with knowledge that you’re not such a brain? And if you don’t know that you’re not such a brain, then you cannot know that you have hands.**

## 4

#### Their discourse of “dependency” stems from repressive rhetoric

NANCY FRASER AND LINDA GORDON, American critical theorist, feminist, and the Henry A. and Louise Loeb Professor of Political and Social Science and professor of philosophy at The New School in New York City. AND professor of history and a University Professor of the Humanities at New York University , "Dependency" Demystified: Inscriptions of Power in a Keyword of the Welfare State, published 1994, ///AHS PB

"Dependency" is the single most crucial term in the current U.S. debate about welfare reform. "Welfare dependent" in the United States means someone who relies on one of the stigmatized programs of public assistance, as distinguished from honorable programs such as old age insurance, which are not called "welfare." The paradigmatic "dependent" is the poor solo mother who collects benefits from the stingy and politically unpopular program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). "Welfare reform" today means reducing "dependency" by getting claimants off the rolls. Few concepts in U.S. social policy discussions do as much ideological work as "dependency." The term leaks a profusion of stigmatizing connotations—raci[st]al, sex[ist]ual, misogynist, and more. It alludes implicitly to a normative state of "independence," which will itself not withstand critical scrutiny. Naming the problems of poor solo mothers and their children "dependency," moreover, tends to make them appear to be individual rather than social problems, as much moral or psychological as economic. The word carries strong emotive and visual associations and a powerful pejorative charge. The most common image is a "welfare mother," typically figured as a young unmarried black woman of uncontrolled sexuality and fertility. This stereotype haunts even the most neutral-sounding talk about dependency in discussions of welfare reform. Why does the word "dependency" carry so much ideological weight? Part of the reason, we suggest, is historical. The term carries the debris of several centuries of poor relief policies that relieved hunger while stigmatizing recipients, often actually impeding their escape from the dole into wage labor. Branding welfare recipients as "dependents" continues a long tradition of opposing dependence to independence. Both terms were redefined in the last few centuries in ways that help[s]ed adapt old traditions of gender, race, and class domination to new social and economic conditions. But the fundamental opposition remains: "independence" is strong, virtuous, white, and male, while "dependence" is weak, disreputable, colored, and/or femalen. In the last half-century, as "dependency" became associated particularly with AFDC, it has intensified disrespect for women's unpaid labor.

#### Drop them to deter oppressive rhetoric in the debate space- they didn’t need include discourse of “dependency” to win case – they also could have used terms like “mutually reliant” to imply that all within the case are equals.

#### The safety of the space is prima facie – we don’t know who’s winning if people can’t engage. Anything that doesn’t immediately denounce atrocities excludes people who have and can experience them.

**Teehan** Ryan Teehan [NSD staffer and competitor from the Delbarton School] – NSD Update comment on the student protests at the TOC in 2014. //Massa

Honestly, I don't think that 99% of what has been said in this thread so far actually matters. It doesn't matter whether you think that these types of assumptions should be questioned. It doesn't matter what accepting this intuition could potentially do or not do. It doesn't matter if you see fit to make, incredibly trivializing and misplaced I might add, links between this and the Holocaust. **All** of the **arguments that talk about how debate is** a **unique** space for questioning assumptions **make an assumption of safety**. They say that this is a space where one is safe to question assumptions and try new perspectives. **That is not true** for everyone. **When we allow arguments that question the wrongness of racism, sexism, homophobia, rape**, lynching, etc., **we make debate unsafe for certain people. The idea that debate is a safe space to question all assumptions is** the definition of **privilege**, it begins with an idea of a debater that can question every assumption. **People who face the actual effects** of the aforementioned things **cannot question those assumptions, and making debate** a space **built around the idea that they can is hostile**. So, you really have a choice. Either 1) say that you do not want these people to debate so that you can let people question the wrongness of everything I listed before, 2) say that you care more about letting debaters question those things than making debate safe for everyone, or 3) make it so that saying things that make debate unsafe has actual repercussions. On "**debate is not the real world**". **Only for people who can separate their existence in "the real world" from their existence in debate.** That means privileged, white, heterosexual males like myself. I don't understand how you can make this sweeping claim when some people are clearly harmed by these arguments. **At the end of the day, you have to figure out whether you care about debate being safe for everyone** involved. I don't think anyone has contested that these arguments make debate unsafe for certain people**. If you care at all about the people involved in debate then don't vote on these arguments**. If you care about the safety and wellbeing of competitors, then don't vote on these arguments. If you don't, then I honestly don't understand why you give up your time to coach and/or judge. The pay can't be that good. I don't believe that you're just in it for the money, which is why I ask you to ask yourselves whether you can justify making debate unsafe for certain people.

## On Case

# Accessibility Formatting

#### Every reason is equally as violent in its creation.

justice must not wait a decision is required immediately It cannot furnish itself with unlimited knowledge of conditions even if it did the moment of decision remains a moment of urgency since it marks interruption of deliberation that precedes it

#### Skep is true

if you have hands, then you are not a brain floating in a vat But how could you know

you are not everything would seem exactly as it does now you would have the same sensory experiences that you’re having now. empirical knowledge of the world must be based upon sensory experiences

#### Their discourse of “dependency” stems from repressive rhetoric

Few concepts in policy discussions do as much ideological work as "dependency." The term leaksraci[st], sex[ist]misogynist and moreThe word carries strong emotive and visual associations haunt even the most neutral-sounding talk about dependency Branding recipients as "dependents help[s] adapt old traditions of domination to new social conditions

#### The safety of the space is prima facie – we don’t know who’s winning if people can’t engage. Anything that doesn’t immediately denounce atrocities excludes people who have and can experience them.

debate is an assumption of safety When we allow arguments that question the wrongness of racism we make debate unsafe for certain people. People who face effects cannot question those assumptions making debate hostile If you care about people involved in debate then don't vote on these arguments