# 1NC vs Westford AW

## 1

#### A] Interpretation: The affirmative may not defend a subset of medicines. “Medicines” refers to medicines in general.

Jake **Nebel 14** [ let’s be real you know who he is], “Jake Nebel on Specifying “Just Governments””, VBriefly, 19 Dec 2014, //Massa

I believe that **debaters shouldn’t specify a government on the living wage topic. The standard argument for this is simple: “just governments” is a plural noun phrase, so it refers to more than one just government**. Most debaters will stop there. But there is much more to say. (Some seem not to care about the plural construction. I plan to address this view in a later article about the parametric conception of topicality.)¶ Some noun phrases include articles like “the,” demonstratives like “these,” possessives like “my,” or quantifiers like “some” or “all.” These words are called determiners. **Bare plurals, including “just governments,” lack determiners.** There’s no article, demonstrative, possessive, or quantifier in front of the noun to tell you how many or which governments are being discussed.¶ We use bare plurals for two main purposes. Consider some examples:¶ Debaters are here.¶ Debaters are smart.¶ In (1), “debaters” seems equivalent to “some debaters.” It is true just in case there is more than one debater around. If I enter a restaurant and utter (1), I speak truly if there are a couple of debaters at a table. This is an existential use of the bare plural, because it just says that there exist things of the relevant class (debaters) that meet the relevant description (being here). In (2), though, “debaters” seems to refer to debaters in general. **This use of the bare plural is generic. Some say that generics refer to kinds of things, rather than particular members of their kinds, or that they refer to typical cases. There is a large literature on understanding generics.** Here my aim is not to figure out the truth conditions for the generic reading of the resolution; I shall simply work with our pre-theoretical grip on the contrast between sentences like (1) and (2).¶ This distinction bears importantly on the resolution. If “just governments” is a generic bare plural, then the debate is about whether just governments in general ought to require that employers pay a living wage. If it is an existential bare plural, then the debate is about whether some just governments—i.e., more than one—ought to require that employers pay a living wage. Only the second interpretation allows one to affirm by specifying a few governments.

#### B] Violation: You only defend –

#### C] Standards:

#### 1. Semantics:

#### 2. Predictability:

#### 3. TVA:

## 2

#### A. Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than “Resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines”. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)*

#### B. Violation: You don’t

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair –

#### a) Ground –

#### b) Limits –

#### 2. Research

## 3

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

## 4

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

**Der****rida,** 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**

#### External world 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.**

## On Case

# Accessibility Formatting

#### A] Interpretation: The affirmative may not defend a subset of medicines. “Medicines” refers to medicines in general.

Jake **Nebel 14** [ let’s be real you know who he is], “Jake Nebel on Specifying “Just Governments””, VBriefly, 19 Dec 2014, //Massa

debaters shouldn’t specify a plural noun phrase refers to more than one Bare plurals lack determiners This use of the bare plural is generic. Some say generics refer to kinds of things, rather than particular members

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

**Derrida,** Jacques Derrida, “Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority” //Massa

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

#### External world 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

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