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#### **International consensus flows aff – ow their evidence on scope**

Pharm-Tech 5/7 [Pharmaceutical Technology. “Over 120 countries back IP rights waiver on Covid-19 vaccines”. 07 May 2021. Accessed 7/29/21. <https://www.pharmaceutical-technology.com/news/ip-waiver-covid-19-vaccines/> //Xu]

In October last year, India and South Africa had floated the proposal to waive IP rights at the World Trade Organization’s (WTO) Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Council to waive such protections of the agreement for some patents and technology in response to Covid-19. The latest proposal would permit poorer countries to produce vaccine by themselves. India has welcomed the US Government’s stance on the initiative noting that the waiver is a major step to facilitate stepping up the production and availability of inexpensive Covid-19 jabs and vital medicines. The WTO agreement on TRIPS permits members countries to offer more extensive intellectual property protection as per their choice. US Trade representative Katherine Tai said: “This is a global health crisis and the extraordinary circumstances of the Covid-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures. “The Administration believes strongly in intellectual property protections, but in service of ending this pandemic, supports the waiver of those protections for Covid-19 vaccines.” Responding to Tai’s statement, WTO director-general Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala said: “I am pleased that the proponents are preparing a revision to their proposal and I urge them to put this on the table as soon as possible so that text-based negotiations can commence. “It is only by sitting down together that we will find a pragmatic way forward, acceptable to all members, which enhances developing countries’ access to vaccines while protecting and sustaining the research and innovation so vital to the production of these life-saving vaccines.”

# 1AC

### Footnote

Here is a link to 21 Savage songs – check it out and feel free to add any 21 savage songs that you think deserves to be on

<https://open.spotify.com/playlist/4QvlxiEdAtVhWbMF8Z0h0r?si=3cBIgVfkQeykWXiwxMCjbQ>

TW – Mentions of sexual assault in the Lenders 18 impact evidence

CSA –

Strake Jesuit DA’s aff – Conquergood 01, Performance Studies: Interventions and Radical Research, Dwight Conquergood, TDR (1988-) Vol. 46, No. 2 (Summer, 2002), pp. 145-156 (12 pages) Published by: [The MIT Press](about:blank) SJDH

Strake Jesuit DH’s aff – DeShields 18, Inte'a, A. DeShields. Spitfire: Framing White Rage in Response to Black Rhetoric. Diss. University of Maryland, Baltimore County, 2018. //Elmer

Other methods – https://www.afsc.org/blogs/news-and-commentary/what-you-need-to-know-about-call-to-abolish-ice

### UNDERVIEW AT BOTTOM

### 1AC – Thesis

#### The date is February 3, 2019. The Immigration and Customs Enforcement raided 21 Savage and took custody as a reaction to his live performance of his song *a lot* ft. J. Cole. He performed the song and freestyled as a strategy to speak up against the elitist system that continues an unjust border patrol.

**Ahmad 20** [Ahmad, Nadia, Climate Cages: Connecting Migration, the Carceral State, Extinction Rebellion, and the Coronavirus through Cicero and 21 Savage (July 21, 2020). Loyola Law Review, New Orleans, Forthcoming, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3657096> or [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3657096 //](http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3657096%20//) LEX JB]

**Started from the bottom straight from the gutter, so I had to go a lil’ harder.**

**The lights was off, the gas was off, so we had to boil up the water.**

**Been through some things so I can’t imagine my kids stuck at the border.**

**Flint still need water. People was innocent, couldn’t get lawyers.**

**– 21 Savage**

Days after the release of the song, “A Lot,” U.S. Customs and Immigration Enforcement **(ICE) arrested the rapper Shéyaa Bin Abraham-Joseph**, known by his stage name as **21 Savage**. He would meet a destiny he had met previously—of being arrested—but this time, **his crime was his immigration status as an undocumented black immigrant**. Shéyaa had been a member of the broader criminal syndicate gang of Bloods in his youth.3 He had a lengthy arrest record from frequent “run-ins” with the law on account of losing those close to him at a young age to violence and the criminal justice system.4 Yet **Shéyaa had turned his life around and become a successful musician and businessman, paying it forward to his community with philanthropic initiatives to end gang violence and promote sports.5 The arrest of this Grammy-nominated artist at a Grammy after-party in Atlanta had all the tell-tale signs of irony and selective law enforcement**. Shéyaa was arrested not only for who he was—an undocumented black immigrant—but also for **what he said**. Shéyaa’s message **in “A Lot” was “a” factor or “the” factor in his subsequent arrest and encagement**. Billboard magazine said he was “one of hip-hop’s most promising new stars with his blunt tales of poverty, gang violence and the trauma they inflict.”6 His arrest sent shockwaves in the entertainment industry.

#### The arrest of 21 Savage is something greater than an ICE investigation. It is an operation by corporatist capitalism to silence immigrants who historically speak up against it, like issues of environmentalism. The way that capitalism structures a system of corporatism proactively excludes immigrants who have their lives destroyed

**Ahmad 20** [Ahmad, Nadia, Climate Cages: Connecting Migration, the Carceral State, Extinction Rebellion, and the Coronavirus through Cicero and 21 Savage (July 21, 2020). Loyola Law Review, New Orleans, Forthcoming, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3657096> or [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3657096 //](http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3657096%20//) LEX JB]

* 21 Savage’s name: Shéyaa Bin Abraham-Joseph

It remains unclear the precise reason that triggered the ICE detention of **Shéyaa.** Likely **his growing popularity, broader public platform, message of intersectional justice, and** the coincidence of **increased incidents of immigration detentions all worked together as a multiplicity of factors**. Nevertheless, **the high-profile arrest was deeply political**, having the potential to moderate the tone and **messaging of the rapper** and other entertainers. **The effect was a silencing because of the threat of deportation. Migration, climate change, and environmental justice are inextricably linked. We can no longer draw neat borders around environmentalism of white spaces**.15 More so, **environmentalism and climate change adaptation efforts can no longer be the exclusive domain of protecting white spaces**. Because of **rising income equality in poor nations, conflict, and political upheaval, migrants are seeking out new places for safety**. From **natural disasters** such as **hurricanes, wildfires, tornadoes, and earthquakes to the horrors of famine, disease**, and religious violence, **people are moving**. We are a planet of populations on the move. The Brookings Institute reported that **in 2017, nearly 68.5 million people were forcibly displaced.**16 Approximately one-third of these (22.5 million to **24 million people**) individuals **were forcibly moved by “sudden onset” weather events**, including flooding, forest fires after droughts, and intensified storms.17 **Climate change is causing a “slow onset”** of events, including “**desertification, sea-level rise, ocean acidification, air pollution, rain pattern shifts and loss of biodiversity**.”18 Journalism professor and author Suketu Mehta puts forward “**that immigrants ‘have become a credit to this country’—the United States” through job growth, decreased crime rates, enhanced cultural innovation,** and as a counterweight to aging populations through their “youth, fertility, and ability to support retirees.”19 Mehta argues that **immigration “corrects the wrongs of colonialism and corporate neocolonialism**.”20 **The arrest and detention of 21 Savage offers a lens into the carceral state and environmentalism, which can also highlight the constraints of environmental law and the pressures on environmental advocates**. Mehta draws from the work of environmental law professor Michael Gerrard, who puts forth that “the United States and other **nations disproportionately responsible for carbon emissions should accept climate change refugees as a form of compensation to them and a form of justice**.”21 The rash of immigration detentions, deportations, and self-deportations highlights parallel environmental struggles. While the struggles may diverge, the systems at play operate in hegemonic unison. If immigration was previously the province of political asylum cases and highly-educated professionals seeking work visas, **climate change has expanded and intensified those struggles**. The information technology engineer from Chennai wanting a better life for family in America is not only seeking out economic opportunity, but a way out of India’s rising communalism and failed efforts to stem rising waters of the Indian Ocean as well as the lack of potable water. Last summer, the water reservoirs in India’s sixth largest city ran dry.22 **The arrest of 21 Savage** in Atlanta,23 a later blackout at a New York federal prison,24 **and arrests of** meatpacking **workers in Mississippi** are isolated events, but taken together, they **are part of a wider** net of **mass incarceration to silence environmental, labor, and human rights**, as well as examples of **denying access to protection from environmental impacts**.25 Climate change will **increase** extreme **weather conditions**, increasing vulnerabilities for those already at the margins— from prison populations to those attempting to cross the borders. **These** incidents were a way to **preserve an economic system known as corporatism through racist immigration and incarceration policies, which later manifested in disparate responses to environmental pollution concerns from the Flint water crisis to protests of the Dakota Access Pipeline**. In Flint, Michigan, residents are paying fines for not paying bills for polluted water. In North Dakota, protesters were arrested for their direct action to stop the construction of the Dakota Access Pipeline. In other words, caging is a strategy—both legal, financial, and political—used against the critics of this corporatist system, which capitalizes upon and targets marginalized communities and vulnerable populations. Corporatism is “a system of interest and/or attitude representation, a particular modal or idealtypical institutional arrangement for linking the associationally organized interests of civil society with the decisional structures of the state.”26 Meanwhile, **the impacts of corporatism are also environmental in that these impacts work to silence environmental efforts and to demonstrate adverse impacts of climate change on frontline communities**. That is, vulnerable communities, located in “sacrifice zones,” have less of a right to be here—in the United States or on the planet— and, therefore, require less of a need for a clean environment, including clean air, clean water, and energy access.

#### These systems are torture

**Lenders 18**, Mark Lenders, 2018, The Effects of Deportation on Families and Communities, Community Psychology: Social Justice Through Collaborative Research and Action, https://www.communitypsychology.com/effects-of-deportation-on-families-communities/ SJ||DH

* TW – mentions of sexual assault

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **Deportation has numerous detrimental impacts on individuals who are deported, and on the families and communities they are forced to leave behind. This policy statement reviews the empirical literature to describe the effects of deportation on the individual, families, and the broader community, in order to inform policy and practice recommendations.** Deportations have markedly increased in the US in the past three decades, with 340,056 people being deported from the country in 2017 (US Department of Homeland Security, 2017). Most people who are deported have lived in the country for over a decade and many are parents or caregivers of US citizens (Brabeck, Lykes & Hershberg, 2012; Brabeck & Xu, 2010; Dreby, 2012; TRAC Immigration, 2006). Approximately 5.9 million US citizen children have at least one caregiver who does not have authorization to reside in the United States (Mathema, 2017). **Immigration policies have moved away from the goal of family reunification, and have the potential to harm US citizen children. For example, the hardship exemption of the Immigration and Nationality Act limits exemptions of deportation to parents, children, and spouses. Consequently, extended family caregivers, such as grandparents, are ineligible for the exemption in spite of any undue hardship caused to their US citizen family members from their deportation** (Zug, 2009). The effects of deportation are felt by individuals, families, and communities. Nearly 4 in 5 families screened in family detention centers have a “credible fear” of persecution should they be forced to return to the countries from which they migrated (US Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2016). **Many of those deported are forced to return to dangerous, turbulent environments, and deportations have resulted in kidnapping, torture, rape, and murder (Stillman, 2018). Deported individuals often find it challenging to support their families, and coupled with the trauma and stigma of the deportation, may find it difficult to maintain contact with family members; this often leads to severed relationships** (Dreby, 2012; Hagan, Castro, & Rodriguez, 2010; Zayas & Bradlee, 2014). Family members left behind suffer multiple psychosocial consequences. Separation of a child from a parent due to deportation is associated with economic hardship, housing instability, and food insecurity (Capps et al., 2015; Chaudhary et al., 2010; Dreby, 2012). Family members are often forced to take on new roles to make ends meet: the remaining caregiver(s) must often work longer hours, leaving little time for contact with children; older children often become primary caregivers of younger siblings and/or must work to support the family, impacting school performance and retention (Chaudhary et al., 2010; Dreby, 2012). **Following deportation of a family member, children demonstrate numerous emotional and behavioral challenges, such as eating and sleeping changes, anxiety, sadness, anger, and withdrawal. Even if the family is ultimately reunited, the consequences of their forced family separation often remain** (Brabeck et al, 2012; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al. 2010). Moreover, the broader community suffers negative consequences of deportation regardless of first-hand experience. Following immigration raids and deportations, community members are often more fearful and mistrustful of public institutions, and less likely to participate in churches, schools, health clinics, cultural activities, and social services (Capps, Rosenblum, Chishti, & Rodríguez, 2011; Hagan et al., 2010; Hagan, Rodriguez, & Castro, 2011; Vargas, 2015). **Studies have also demonstrated that immigrant adults are emotionally taxed following deportations and the threat of deportations in their communities; associated anxiety and psychological stress has been linked to cardiovascular risk factors** (Brabeck et al, 2012; Martinez, Ruelas, & Granger, 2017; Torres et al., 2018). **Immigrant children living in communities where immigration raids have taken place feel abandoned, isolated, fearful, traumatized, and depressed (**Capps, Castañeda, Chaudry, & Santos, 2007). Moreover, children – regardless of immigration status – experience fear and shame regarding deportation, which impacts their sense of self and wellbeing (Dreby, 2012). In order to assuage the myriad devastating consequences of deportation on individuals, families, and communities, the US should make policy and practice changes. Federal immigration policies should keep families together through comprehensive immigration reform that ends the threat of deportation and bolsters hardship exemptions for all family members. Local communities should prioritize safety and inclusion for all families, regardless of immigration status, by developing programs to foster support networks, sense of belonging, mental health/healing, building community, and collective political action, as these types of programs foster hope and wellness for children and families. INTRODUCTION This brief first describes specific aspects of current US immigration policies. It then reviews the empirical literature to describe the effects of deportation on the individual, families, and the broader community. The literature focuses primarily on deportations of Mexican and Central American immigrants, which are the largest groups of immigrants to the US at this time. Findings from these studies form the foundation for policy and practice recommendations, which comprises the last section of this policy statement, but there is no reason to expect that these findings are not also applicable to other immigrant groups. POLICY BACKGROUND Changes in US policies around immigration and deportation affect individuals, families, and communities in which deportations occur. Over the past three decades, US policies and procedures have changed markedly twice. In 1996, the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (ADEPA) and the Illegal Immigrant Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) were passed into law. These laws expanded the types of offenses for deportation, enabled retroactive deportation, and weakened judicial review over deportations (Brabeck et al., 2011; Hagan et al., 2010). The second change came after the 2001 passage of the USA PATRIOT Act, which also increased administrative authority over deportations. With these changes came a massive increase in deportations. From 1900 to 1990, approximately 20,000 people were deported each year. In the mid-1990s, the deportation rate increased by 800 percent to 180,000 a year, but has since more than doubled to 340,056 deportations in 2017 (US Department of Homeland Security, 2017, Table 39). Of those deported, approximately 40% in 2016 had a prior criminal conviction (US Department of Homeland Security, 2017, Table 41), meaning that most enforcement policy is aimed at those who do not have criminal convictions (Brabeck et al., 2011; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al., 2010, 2011; US Government Accounting Office, 2009). The majority of those deported have lived in the US for over a decade, with the median length of residence being 14 years (Brabeck & Xu, 2010; TRAC Immigration, 2006). Further, a growing number are parents whose children are US citizens (Braback et al., 2011; Dreby, 2012). These changes in immigration policy have moved the US away from the explicit goal of post-World War II immigration policy: family reunification (Hagan et al., 2010). Moreover, although the hardship exemption to the Immigration and Nationality Act authorizes the cancellation of deportation if such deportation would cause undue hardship to a US citizen, it limits deportation stays to the person’s spouse, parent, or child. Consequently, grandparents, who are often primary caregivers of US citizen children, are ineligible for this exemption (Zug, 2009). PSYCHOSOCIAL EFFECTS OF DEPORTATION ON THE INDIVIDUAL In addition to the trauma, violence or abuse experienced prior to migration or during detention, many immigrants who are deported return to extremely dangerous and often turbulent environments in their countries of origin. Some even face torture, abuse, rape, or murder. Researchers at the Global Migration Project developed a database recording people who had been deported and then faced death or other harms (Stillman, 2018). The researchers contacted more than two hundred local legal-aid organizations, domestic violence shelters, immigrants’ rights-groups nationwide, as well as migrant shelters, humanitarian operations, law offices, and mortuaries across Central America, and also interviewed several families (Stillman, 2018). Their database includes numerous cases where deportations resulted in harm, including kidnapping, torture, rape, and murder (Stillman, 2018). This is especially important to consider given 79% of families screened in family detention centers have a “credible fear” of persecution if they returned to the countries from which they migrated (US Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2016). PSYCHOSOCIAL EFFECTS OF DEPORTATION ON FAMILY MEMBERS Nearly 10% of US families with children have at least one member without citizenship, and 5.9 million US citizen children have at least one caregiver who does not have authorization to reside in the United States (Mathema, 2017; Romero, 2003). Therefore, deportation policies and procedures affect many U.S. citizens. Several studies provide evidence that the forcible separation of a family is associated with negative psychosocial effects for children and other family members (Capps et al., 2015; Chaudhary et al., 2010; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al, 2011; National Council of La Raza, 2007). Indeed, we would expect the effects to be severe for these families since separation is not by choice and often occurs suddenly and unexpectedly, with little preparation or planning (Brabeck et al., 2012; Dreby, 2012). In this section, we discuss effects on children and the family unit. **The effects of sudden and forcible separation of a parent due to deportation on children are considerable. In a study of 190 children in 85 immigrant families across six US cities or towns spanning from the west coast to the south, Chaudhary and colleagues (2010) concluded that children faced serious challenges due to deportation of a parent, including economic hardship, housing instability, food insecurity, and separation from parents. Children experienced behavioral changes in eating and sleeping habits, and emotional changes such as increased crying, anxiety, anger, aggression, withdrawal, and a heightened sense of fear. These outcomes were still present six months later. In another study of 91 parents and 110 children in 80 households in Ohio and New Jersey, results were similar** (Dreby, 2012). A third study conducted in three cities after immigration raids also showed consistent results, with children feeling abandoned, isolated, fearful, traumatized, and depressed (Capps, Castañeda, Chaudry, & Santos, 2007). In fact, in a comprehensive review of the literature that ranged from 2009-2013, Capps and colleagues (2015) discerned that children experienced psychological trauma, material hardship, residential instability, academic withdrawal, and family dissolution after the deportation of a family member. Children who were present at the moment a parent was detained tended to have greater emotional, cognitive, and behavioral effects (Chaudhary et al., 2010). Furthermore, after a deportation, older children often needed to take on jobs to help support the family, which impacted school performance, persistence, and retention. The family unit is also greatly affected by deportation. The majority of those deported are men (TRAC Immigration, 2014). When this person is a father, frequently mothers become single parents, often with no or little income, and sometimes facing large legal bills (Dreby, 2012). Indeed, a study of immigration enforcement in six US locations between 2006 and 2009 found that families lost 40 to 90% of their income, or an average of 70%, within six months of a parent’s immigration related arrest, detention, or deportation (Capps et al., 2016). Given this context, mothers often work long hours, frequently at more than one job, which results in reduced contact with their children. Older children often become primary caregivers to younger siblings due to lack of affordable child care options. Moreover, parents fear losing custody of their children because of their new circumstances or threats made by immigration officials (Brabeck et al., 2012; Dreby, 2012). Furthermore, deported parents find it difficult to find work that would enable them to help support their families who are still in the US, which is demoralizing. This new circumstance, coupled with the trauma and stigma of the deportation, may make it difficult to maintain contact with children. A diminished emotional connection, combined with attachment-related issues brought on by a sudden separation, can effectively sever father-child and husband-wife relationships (Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al., 2010; Zayas & Bradlee, 2014). Because of these dynamics, it is often mothers who bear the largest burdens after a deportation. Even if the family is reunited, effects of the forced separation on all family members often remain (Brabeck et al, 2012; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al. 2010). The effects of potential parental deportation on U.S. citizen children are arguably complex; however, in one study, children who accompanied their deported parents back to Mexico described profound adjustment difficulties, including a sense of loss regarding their future and the resources available to them (Gulbas & Zayas, 2017). These impacts extend beyond the nuclear family to grandparents and other relatives. Three of four Latinx[[3]](http://www.scra27.org/what-we-do/policy/policy-position-statements/effects-deportation-families/#_ftn3) grandparents co-parent with their grandchild’s parent(s) (Fuller-Thompson & Minkler, 2007). Moreover, more than 4.4 million children live in grandparent-headed households, thousands of whom are US citizen grandchildren of unauthorized grandparents. With the number of grandchildren being raised by grandparents on the rise and higher than it has ever been in this country, grandparent deportation is of great concern. Zug (2009) estimates that thousands of grandparents who are primary caregivers to US citizen grandchildren are at at risk for deportation. Grandparent-headed households already face more challenges than parent-headed households, including higher rates of poverty and stressful life events with fewer resources (Fuller-Thompson & Minkler, 2007). Although grandparent caregivers experience these challenges, their grandchildren do much better than those placed into foster care, and grandparent caregiving is associated with more positive grandchild psychological wellbeing and healthy development across the lifespan (Copen, 2006). When grandparents face deportation, their grandchildren may not only lack a primary caregiver (if their grandparent is co-parenting), but may lose their only caregiver and be placed in foster care, putting them at risk for multiple placements and poorer outcomes. The effects on children and other family members when another family member is deported are exacerbated by limited mental health services. Furthermore, when they are available, there are still barriers to accessing resources (Capps et al., 2015). These barriers range from a lack of therapists who are able to provide culturally-informed services, to a lack of insurance coverage, to unfamiliarity with therapy and mistrust of local services due to the deportation that has occurred (Brabeck & Xu, 2010; Hagan et al., 2011).

#### Thus, the only ethical demand is to endorse a politics of Pan-Africanism through the embodiment of 21 Savage

**Asante 16** [Asante, Godfried; Sekimoto, Sachi; Brown, Christopher (2016). Becoming “Black”: Exploring the Racialized Experiences of African Immigrants in the United States. Howard Journal of Communications, 27(4), 367–384. doi:10.1080/10646175.2016.1206047 // LEX JB]

It is **necessary to add transnational voices to the struggle against racism, racial inequalities, and Black identity politics, especially African students who have** the **socioeconomic status** and relative privileges as the participants’ experiences **ascertain a paradigm of renewed Black subjectivity**. For instance, **Pan-Africanists such as Kwame Nkrumah (the first president of Ghana) and Jomo Kenyatta** (the first prime minister of Kenya) were all **African students in the United States who went back to Africa to raise racial consciousness and fight for independence from the British**. Their fight against colonialism was not exclusive of the racial discrimination faced by African Americans in the United States, but their politics connected and coincided with the struggle against Black suppression everywhere. A transnational PanAfricanist movement is not new; W.E.B. Dubois played a significant role in developing the idea of Pan-Africanism and marshaling a transnational political movement around it in the 1900s until he passed away in Accra, Ghana. These examples from the past prove that **it is possible to re-align Pan-African identity politics of African migrants with anti-racist struggle** in the United States. According to Mostern (1999), “all politics can be described as an engaged relationship between the social location of a particular political actor and the social totality in which their action takes place” (p. 6). **By focusing on the similarities of struggles and historical background, Pan-African identity can feed into the larger Black identity politics and not just maintaining an African ethnic solidarity in the United States. Black migrants can/should join the fight against the dominant cultural construct of Blackness and racist structures that continue to oppress people of African descent with benign policies and procedures that advance the interest of White elites. By downplaying the ethnic difference and focusing on racial inequalities, African migrants can use their Pan-African identity as an anti-racist discourse rather than an exclusionist ideology.**

### 1AC – Framework

#### [1] Sheyaa’s lyricism can redefine subjectivities and break down borders, enhancing cultural range and changing political narratives – the aff controls the internal link to movement building

**Morgan Bennett 11** [Marcyliena Morgan and Dionne Bennett “Hip-Hop & the Global Imprint of a Black Cultural Form” Daedalus , Spring 2011, Vol. 140, No. 2, Race, Inequality & Culture, volume 2 (Spring 2011), pp. 176-196 The MIT Press on behalf of American Academy of Arts & Sciences [https://www.jstor.org/stable/23047460 //](https://www.jstor.org/stable/23047460%20//) LEX JB]

**While** mainstream **American discourses** have marginalized, maligned, and **trivialized hip-hop music and culture, multicultural youth in America and around the world have come together to turn hip-hop into one of the most dynamic arts and culture movements in recent history. It is disturbingly ironic that the nation that produced hip-hop culture has the least respect for it**; meanwhile, the United Nations and individual countries are crossing the bridge that the **global hip-hop nation has been building for decades. Nations are using hip-hop to see, hear, understand, serve, and, ultimately, be transformed for the better by their brilliant and powerful young people.** Hip-hop's aesthetic culture - which began with the four core elements of **rapping, deejaying, breaking, and graffiti art** - now **encompasses** all those elements along with **an ever-growing and diversifying range of artistic, cultural, intellectual, political, and social practices, products, and performances**. These developments include, but are not limited to, **studio, live, and digital music production; writing and rhythmic performance of spoken words alone and to beats**; street, club, and studio dance innovations ; fashion and style expressions; visual arts, including graffiti innovations; theater and performance arts; international club cultures' engagement with diverse music, dance, and style expressions ; and digital, public, and academic knowledge-production and distribution practices. The artistic achievements of hip-hop represent, by themselves, a remarkable contribution to world culture. However, the **hip-hop nation has not just made art; it has made art with the vision and message of changing worlds - locally, nationally, and globally. The hip-hop nation has done more than heed Public Enemy's famous call to "Fight the Power." It has created and become the power. U.S. and global hip hop heads have put into practice and expanded on psychiatrist Frantz Fanon's theory: namely, that an individual or group that "has a language consequently possesses the world expressed and implied by that language Mastery of language affords remarkable power."62 Citizens of the global hip-hop nation have not merely mastered a language, they have formed a new one. They have used that new language to redefine, name, and create their many worlds and worldviews. Through their unprecedented global movement of art and culture, the citizens of the hip-hop nation have used their unique and collective aesthetic voices** both to "possess" and transform the world, a process that has not merely afforded them power, but has also enabled them to produce new forms of power, beauty, and knowledge.

#### Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best methodologically breaks down borders. The status quo is predicated on the selective law enforcement that targeted 21 Savage, but we say these borders and enforcement shouldn’t exist. Independently vote me up for breaking the border of 21 Savage literature in debate. Fiat is illusory, but the k has material impact on us as there are existing borders in debate.

**Giroux 05** (Giroux is an American and Canadian scholar and cultural critic and received his doctorate from Carnegie Melon. “Border Crossing: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education” Second Edition 2005 Taylor & Francis Group https://www.amazon.com/Border-Crossings-Cultural-Politics-Education/dp/0415951496) SJ\\DH

* Link offense by providing a counter method on how to resist boundaries

When I wrote Border Crossings in 1992, there was a theoretical rupture in the various disciplines and integrated fields of the humanities and liberal arts. What would later be labeled as “the cultural turn” generated a new-found interest and a host of complex theories attempting to reclaim the importance of culture, language, discourse, difference, agency, power, and politics. Border Crossings approached the heady theoretical innovations of postmodernism, poststructuralism, and a host of other discursive interventions with a certain amount of caution and respect. But more importantly, especially in light of these emerging theoretical discourses, Border Crossings attempted to draw upon these new and complex fields in order to rethink the nature of politics and pedagogy, especially as they interfaced and played out as ideological and cultural practices in a multitude of other educational sites beyond the traditional sphere of formal schooling. Needless to say, changing historical conditions posit new problems, define different projects, and often demand fresh discourses. In some cases, theories fashioned in one historical moment seem hopelessly out of date, if not irrelevant, in another. Any critical theory both defines and is defined by the problems posed by the contexts it attempts to address. While Border Crossings cannot escape the issue of changing historical conditions, many of the chapters in the original book have not only held up well over the last decade, but also appear more relevant today than when they were first written. Borders and border crossing as political and heuristic metaphors still occupy a central, if not more concretized, place in any viable social and educational theory. **In an era of unprecedented global flows both real and virtual, the ethics and politics of border crossing appear more pressing to the current historical juncture than when I first engaged the concept over a decade ago. For me, the concept of borders provides a continuing and crucial referent for understanding the co-mingling—sometimes clash—of multiple cultures, languages, literacies, histories, sexualities, and identities. Thinking in terms of borders allows one to critically engage the struggle over those territories, spaces, and contact zones where power operates to either expand or to shrink the distance and connectedness among individuals, groups, and places.** In the broader political sense, the concept of borders and border crossing serves to highlight that the goal of politics is transformative of both relations of power as well as public consciousness. **With the accelerated growth of global markets, borders, ironically, appear more constrained than ever before as the ever-widening gap between the rich and the poor leads to greater insecurity and instability. New forms of authoritarianism and militarism now attempt to contain oppressed groups, reduce citizenship to consumerism, and wage war on every conceivable sphere of public life. The porousness of borders in the afterglow of the toppled Berlin Wall became impervious fortresses in the new millennium, a militarized response to a world plunged into the Great War Against Terror. The proliferation of policed borders not only requires a new politics, but also a new political vocabulary and a strategy of resistance through which a public pedagogy can be forged capable of constructing what Chandra Mohanty calls forms of “transborder democratic citizenship.”1 The concept of a borderless world as used in this book, while seemingly utopian, speaks powerfully to both deconstructing the meaning of globalization** and redefining it around democratic values rather than through the ideology of market fundamentalism and its ever-growing alliance with the forces of militarism. I am convinced that the mutually related concepts of borders and border crossing are even more timely today in light of the growing need on the part of many educators, progressives, artists, and cultural workers to rethink the meaning of politics for the twenty-first century. **As war, fear, and virulent contempt for social needs have become the dominant motifs shaping the domestic and foreign policies of the United States, borders have become the primary category for signifying spaces of confinement, internment, punishment, surveillance, and control**. A militarization of public life has emerged under the combined power and influence of neoliberal zealots, religious fanatics, and far right-wing neo-conservatives who currently control the United States government. The primacy of a politics of constraining borders is seen also in the destruction of a liberal democratic political order and a growing culture of surveillance, inequality, and cynicism. As the United States increasingly imprisons more of its poor youth of color, rings the globe with military bases, transforms agencies for immigration into those of homeland security, and expands the imperatives of empire in a reckless invasion and occupation of Iraq, the signs of a highly militarized society become more visible than ever. In a post-September 11th world, American power is being restructured domestically around a growing culture of fear and a rapidly increasing militarization of public space and culture. As U.S. military action is spreading under the guise of an unlimited war against terrorism, public spaces on the domestic front are increasingly being organized around values supporting a highly militarized, patriarchal, and jingoistic culture that is undermining centuries of democratic gains. Borders increasingly appear more rigid, entrenched, and impassible as the United States moves inexorably toward a more closed and authoritarian society. We are living in dangerous times in which a new type of post-democratic society is emerging, one that builds on ancient historical tendencies but is unlike anything we have seen in the past—a society in which concentrated economic and political power reinforce each other through a media consolidated in the hands of a few multinational corporations. Unlike any other time in American history, we are living in a period in which a culture of fear and concentrated wealth reinforce each other so as to drastically limit the possibilities of a democratic society. Not only are civil liberties being rolled back, and public resources gutted because of a massive $422 billion deficit, but power no longer appears to reside largely within the sphere of politics, controlled largely by nation states. **Power is now set free from its political shackles and resides primarily with economic and military forces.** Political power is being replaced by economic power just as state sovereignty is being replaced by corporate sovereignty.2 Power has now become coercive, roaming the globe for new markets under the guise of American triumphalism and the quest for the rewards of empire. The United States is increasingly marked by a poverty of critical public discourse, making it more difficult for the American people to appropriate a critical language outside of the market that would allow them to link private problems to public concerns and issues. **Within this utterly privatized discourse, politics conceived as public activity is replaced with a politics that is banal, reduced to the politics of lifestyle choices, tabloid spectacle, or “patriotic” conformism. One result is a social order that seems dangerously incapable of questioning itself, even as it wages a merciless, top-down war against the poor, the young, [Wom[x]n], people of color, and the elderly. The obsession with the private (even as the right to privacy evaporates) not only burdens politics and undermines critical forms of individual and social agency, it also negates any viable notion of the public good and the social contract. As the social contract is shredded, government relies more heavily on its policing and military functions, giving free reign to the principle of security and border patrols at the expense of an open, free society. A culture of fear now overshadows a commitment to public service, endorsing property rights over human rights. A spreading culture of fear in an age of automated surveillance and repressive legislation is creating a security state that gives people the false choice between being safe or being free.** Even as surveillance cameras make their way into the nation’s public schools and FBI agents hang out in libraries and bookstores in order to examine what people are reading, there is barely a protest from academics or the general public over the shredding of constitutional freedoms and civil liberties. It gets worse. The CIA and the Pentagon are now allowed to engage in domestic intelligence work; the Patriot Act allows people to be detained indefinitely in secret without access to either lawyers or family; children are not only held without legal representation as enemy combatants in possibly inhumane conditions at the military’s infamous Camp Delta at Guantanamo Bay, but they are also subjected to abuse and torture by American soldiers at the infamous Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq.3 The war against terrorism increasingly appears to be a war against immigrants, dissent, and democracy itself as the racial state extends the ugly reach of discrimination under the guise of Homeland Security.4 Under such circumstances, the fundamental governing principles of democracy are not just being subverted but deliberately sabotaged. **This kind of democracy is the problem, not the solution. What all this suggests is that since Border Crossings was written, the American state has changed radically.** No longer viewed as a force for the public good and social justice, it now operates largely as a legitimating force for corporate power, willingly disposed to serve the needs of concentrated wealth, racial disparity, corporate globalization, and empire. Under the pressure of a relentless campaign of top-down class, racial, and ideological warfare, the state is being hollowed out and the public sector is being stripped not only of its positive social and democratic functions, but is increasingly reduced to its policing and repressive functions. In the shadow of the tragic and horrible events of September 11th, a brute authoritarianism becomes increasingly more ominous as society is organized relentlessly around a culture of fear, cynicism, and unbridled self-interest. Within this post-9/11 space, matters of politics and pedagogy coincide to produce a new kind of authoritarianism, one in which consent is manufactured and the militarization of everyday life proceeds largely unchallenged. While critical pedagogy was a fundamental concept for expanding the possibility of democracy in the first edition of Border Crossings, my focus has now shifted to the broader concept of public pedagogy which, I argue, is essential to defining the nature of politics itself. At the dawn of the new millennium, an authoritarian regime proceeds within the parameters of what I call a new kind of public pedagogy, one in which the production, dissemination, and circulation of ideas emerges from the educational force of the entire culture. Public pedagogy in this sense refers to a powerful ensemble of ideological and institutional forces whose aim is to produce competitive, self-interested individuals vying for their own material and ideological gain. Corporate public pedagogy now largely cancels out or devalues gender, class-specific, and racial injustices of the existing social order by absorbing the democratic impulses and practices of civil society within narrow economic relations. This form of dominant public pedagogy has become an all-encompassing cultural horizon for producing market identities, values, and practices. The good life, in this discourse, “is construed in terms of our identities as consumers—we are what we buy.”5 For example, the Pentagon even considered, if only for a short time, turning the war on terror and security concerns over to futures markets, subject to online trading. Thus, noncommodified public spheres are replaced by commercial spheres as the substance of critical democracy is emptied out and replaced by a democracy of goods available to those with purchasing power and to the increasing expansion of the cultural and political power of corporations throughout the world. **Dominant public pedagogy with its narrow and imposed schemes of classification and limited modes of identification uses the educational force of the culture to negate the basic conditions for critical agency.** As public space is increasingly commodified and the state is aligned more closely with capital, public pedagogy mobilizes power in the interest of a Darwinian world order marked by the increasing removal of autonomous spheres of cultural production such as journalism, publishing, and film; the destruction of collective structures capable of counteracting the widespread imposition of commercial values and effects of market forces; the creation of a global reserve army of the unemployed; and the subordination of nation-states to the real masters of the economy. As I point out in the third section of Border Crossings, the new sites of public pedagogy which have become the organizing force of market fundamentalism are not restricted to instrumental curricula, blackboards, and test taking. They do not simply incorporate the limited forms of address found in schools. Such sites operate within a wide variety of social institutions and formats including sports and entertainment media, cable television networks, the Internet, churches, and channels of elite and popular culture such as advertising. Profound transformations have taken place in the public sphere, producing new sites of pedagogy marked by a distinctive confluence of new digital and media technologies, growing concentrations of corporate power, and unparalleled meaning-producing capacities. Unlike traditional forms of pedagogy, knowledge and desire are inextricably connected to modes of pedagogical address mediated through unprecedented electronic technologies that include high-speed computers, new types of digitized film and CD-ROMs. The result is a public pedagogy that plays a decisive role in producing a diverse cultural sphere that gives new meaning to education as a political force. What is surprising about the cultural politics of market fundamentalism is that many social theorists have either ignored or largely underestimated the symbolic and pedagogical dimensions of the struggle that neoliberal corporate power has put into place for the last twenty years, particularly under the ruthless administration of George W. Bush. In the years since I have written Border Crossings, neoliberalism—with its unbridled support of the market as a template for all social and economic relations—has become the hegemonic ideology of our time. Much more than an economic theory, neoliberalism can also be defined as a cultural politics, one that created an array of institutions and public spheres from which to produce, disseminate, and secure its ideology, values, and views of the world. As I mentioned previously, power no longer resides within a politics shaped by the borders of the nation-state. Power escapes such traditional boundaries of politics and in so doing redefines both the meaning and the sites in which power is expressed and can be challenged. This new edition of Border Crossings attempts to critically understand and engage the increasing mutually determining forces of neoliberalism and militarization as they work through the modalities of race, class, gender, and youth. Questions of boundaries and borders dominate how the United States and much of the world now think about politics, power, history, and culture. **The concept of border crossing not only critiques those borders that confine experience and limit the politics of crossing diverse geographical, social, cultural, economic, and political borders, it also calls for new ways to forge a public pedagogy capable of connecting the local and the global**, the economic sphere and cultural politics, as well as public and higher education and the pressing social demands of the larger society. At stake here is the possibility of imagining and struggling for new forms of civic courage and citizenship that expand the boundaries of a global democracy. In the 1990s, the politics of difference dominated social and political theory. While differences are still crucial to any viable notion of social theory and democracy, there is an increased need for a politics and a notion of border crossing that can work across the fault lines of nations, classes, races, sexualities, and religions as they operate to create new forms of division, demarcation, and separation. Politics can no longer privilege the private over the public, texts over social contexts, or cultural identity over a politics that favors questions of social and public responsibility. Identity politics must be enlarged and ultimately subordinated to a broader notion of democratic politics, one that expands the connections between the public and the private while offering a common ground on which to build joint alliances and create the conditions necessary for a vibrant and substantive democracy. And it is precisely at this theoretical juncture that the concept of border has been expanded in this new edition of Border Crossings. The concept of border crossing now represents a project and commitment to both global democracy and the search for “a notion of commonality without which a refounding of democratic politics seems impossible, even unimaginable. . . . .”6 Recognizing that borders for many people are both enabling and exclusionary, Border Crossings attempts to engage the complex and dynamic force of the borderlands that people inhabit and cross through a range of pedagogical strategies and ideologies in which the naming, marking, and crossing of various cultural and geographical borders are addressed within the specificity of different contexts, strategies, and pedagogical practices. Against the crafting of monolithic contexts and fixed images of the other, Border Crossings raises the question of how politics and pedagogy might be practiced differently across a range of cultural, political, economic, and geographical boundaries. In doing so, the concept of border has been revised in this book to foreground the complexity of the relationship between power and politics, on the one hand, and agency and social change on the other. Similarly, Border Crossings puts a renewed emphasis on the need for academics to recognize that the most important relationship between intellectuals and the world is organized through the modalities of economic and cultural power. Intellectuals do not merely exist in universities, speak through the discourse of academic disciplines, and produce knowledge, they also exist in institutional spaces and ideological relations shot through with power and politics. And as the forces of market fundamentalism, militarization, and empire spread throughout the world, they are accompanied by the legitimating discourses produced by intellectuals. This suggests that such intellectuals become not only aware of the political forces that influence them and the institutions in which they labor, but also connect their work to the world in which they live while furthering the possibilities of shaping a society through the historical legacies and promises of liberty, equality, justice, and freedom. The borders of our diverse identities, subjectivities, experiences, and communities connect us to each other more than they separate us, especially as such borders are continually changing and mutating within the fast forward dynamics of globalization. How we theorize those connections as a force of tension, domination, and emancipatory possibilities is a difficult task, one that this book takes very seriously as part of a larger attempt to broaden not only the range of our commitments to others but also to develop more constructive, inclusive, and democratic communities. **Pedagogy plays a central role in this task because it is the sphere in which matters of responsibility, social action and political intervention are learned, developed, and put into play. Pedagogy in this sense becomes directive and performative** in that it is not merely about deconstructing texts but about situating politics itself within a broader set of relations that addresses what it might mean to create modes of individual and social agency that enable rather than shut down democratic values, practices, and forms of sociality. In short, this edition of Border Crossings points to the need for academics, artists, cultural workers, and others to address the crossing of borders not only as a resource for theoretical competency and critical understanding, but also as a pedagogical practice that promotes the possibility of interpretation as a challenge to the coming police state and as an intervention in the shaping of a more democratic global social order.

### 1AC – Advocacy

#### Thus, the advocacy – The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines – spec in cross to avoid friv theory

Every IP

Jurisdiction in every country

### 1AC – Contention

#### Imperialist countries are blocking WTO access to medicines.

Doctors Without Borders 3/9 [Doctors Without Borders - USA, 3-9-2021, **"US must stop blocking WTO waiver on COVID-19 medical tools,"** [https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/what-we-do/news-stories/news/us-must-stop-blocking-wto-waiver-covid-19-medical-tools //](https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/what-we-do/news-stories/news/us-must-stop-blocking-wto-waiver-covid-19-medical-tools%20//) JB]

* MSF – Medecins Sans Frontieres or Doctors Without Borders

**MSF’s** international **president appeals to governments, including the US, to stop stonewalling the process**. NEW YORK/GENEVA, MARCH 9, 2021—**As governments meet for** another round of **talks at the World Trade Organization** (WTO) tomorrow, **Doctors Without Borders**/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) **is urging the US and other governments to stop**[**blocking**](https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/what-we-do/news-stories/news/msf-governments-must-support-weeks-historic-move-wto-prevent-covid-19)**a landmark waiver on intellectual property (IP) on**[**COVID-19**](https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/covid19)**medical products. Governments should** immediately **stop stonewalling and allow formal negotiations at the WTO to start**. **The** temporary **waiver would apply to certain IP on COVID-19 medical tools and technologies until herd immunity is reached. “Even after one year of this pandemic—and 2.5 million deaths—we still see certain governments denying that removing monopolies on COVID-19 medical tools will help increase people’s access to needed treatments, vaccines, and tests going forward**,” said Dr. Christos Christou, MSF’s international president. **“The waiver proposal offers all governments opportunities to take action for better collaboration in development, production, and supply of COVID** medical tools **without being restricted by private industry’s interests and actions. And**, crucially, it would give governments all available tools to ensure global access. **Countries** must **stop stonewalling** and [**show the leadership required to deliver on the ‘global solidarity**’](https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/what-we-do/news-stories/news/us-government-must-prioritize-global-access-covid-19-medicines) they have so often declared **during this pandemic**. It’s time to **champion access to medical tools for everyone, wherever they live.” With highly infectious new variants of the coronavirus spreading in many low- and middle-income countries, it is critical to ensure any existing and upcoming medical tools are accessible in sufficient quantities and in a timely manner**, especially for frontline health workers in developing countries, [including MSF teams](https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/what-we-do/news-stories/news/msf-southern-africa-urgently-needs-covid-19-vaccines-new-strain). **If increasing the number of global suppliers of medical tools is not prioritized, people in these countries will remain in a disproportionately disadvantageous position for access**. The proposed IP waiver could provide a more expedited and automatic policy option for governments at the international level to facilitate increased access instead of only relying on voluntary measures by the pharmaceutical industry. Enabled by IP monopolies, corporations continue to pursue secretive and limited commercial deals—primarily with high-income countries that can pay the most—that exclude many low-and middle-income countries even in the midst of the pandemic. **The waiver** proposal **could help by removing legal uncertainties and risks for potential producers and governments so they could quickly start preparing to scale up production and supply of treatments, vaccines, and other essential medical tools needed around the world**. [In Brazil](https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/what-we-do/news-stories/news/brazil-covid-19-disaster-unfolding-amazon), where healthcare workers have struggled to provide care during multiple waves of the pandemic so far, MSF witnessed how emerging waves saturated the existing health system resulting in rationing of medical equipment and interventions. “**From the early days in the pandemic when governments were competing to get access to certain diagnostics and protective equipment, it was clear that countries like Brazil and many others would be at the back of the line when it came to accessing scarce medical resources**,” said Felipe de Carvalho, MSF’s Access Campaign coordinator in Brazil. “**Waiving monopolies will help level the playing field in this pandemic and ensure access for all**.” Despite the clear public health benefits that the monopoly waiver proposal offers, a small group of nations is rigorously hindering the start of formal negotiations at the WTO. At the same time, **many of the countries blocking or delaying the proposal—including the US, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Japan, Norway, Switzerland, the UK, and countries in the EU—have also secured the majority of available vaccines, much more than needed to vaccinate their entire populations**. “More and more low- and middle-income countries are getting very serious about making this pandemic monopoly waiver a reality, so it’s time for countries that are blocking it to do the right thing and stop standing in the way,” said Yuanqiong Hu, senior legal and policy advisor at MSF’s Access Campaign. “Governments that oppose the monopoly waiver proposal know that simply asking pharmaceutical corporations to voluntarily do the right thing will not get us anywhere, **when these attempts have so far failed to secure global access to COVID-19 medical tools for people who urgently need them. It’s time for change, not charity**.” The waiver [was originally proposed by India and South Africa](https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/what-we-do/news-stories/news/msf-calls-governments-support-landmark-move-wto-suspend-patents-during) in October 2020 and is now officially backed by 58 sponsoring governments, with approximately 100 countries supporting the proposal. To date, the waiver proposal has gained wide support by hundreds of civil society organizations across the globe. It has also been welcomed by a number of international organizations, including the World Health Organization (WHO), the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), the Drugs for Neglected Diseases Initiative (DNDi), South Centre, Unitaid, and Third World Network. Recently, [more than 115 Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) urged the European Commission and the European Council](https://haiweb.org/over-100-meps-call-for-a-trips-waiver/) to drop their opposition to the monopoly waiver proposal.

#### The plan solves – Doctors Without Borders is an organization that allows refugees at the border to countergaze and realize consciousness. This reaffirms breaking down borders through access of medical supply.

Doctors Without Borders [Doctors Without Borders - USA, No Date, "Global migration and refugee crisis," [https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/refugees //](https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/refugees%20//) JB]

* MSF – Medecins Sans Frontieres or Doctors Without Borders

**There are** now [**82 million forcibly displaced people**](https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/figures-at-a-glance.html)**around the world**—more than at any time in modern history. **These** are **people** who have **fled extreme dangers, whether to escape relentless bombing, an invading army, gang violence, or other life-threatening circumstances**. Those who have been uprooted from their homes often face further struggles on their journey to find safety, including **lack of access to essential needs like clean water, food, shelter, personal security, and health care. Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) provides medical care to refugees and displaced people all over the world. Increasingly, we see that people on the move are trying to survive not just the harrowing challenges of migration itself, but the harmful deterrence policies put in place by governments trying to keep out migrants and asylum seekers at all costs.**

### 1AC – Method

#### [1] Trivialism

**Kabay 08** [Paul Douglas Kabay, (PhD thesis, School of Philosophy, Anthropology, and Social Inquiry) "A Defense Of Trivialism" The University Of Melbourne, 2008, https://minerva-access.unimelb.edu.au/handle/11343/35203, DOA:10-25-2017]

Let us define a trivial entity as an entity that instantiates every predicate, i.e. an entity of which **everything is true.** One of the things true of **a trivial entity** is that it **exists in a reality in which trivialism is true. Hence, if a trivial entity exists, then trivialism is true.** But is it true that there exists a trivial entity? Here is an argument for thinking that it is true: **1) Every being (or entity or object) is either trivial or nontrivial 2) It is not the case that every being is nontrivial 3) Hence, there exists a trivial being**

#### [2] Negating affirms because it assumes that the 1AC is a statement that is worthy of contestation which means our arguments are legitimate.

#### [3] There are infinite worlds, the aff is true in one which is sufficient.

**Vaidman 2** Vaidman, Lev, 3-24-2002, "Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," No Publication, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qm-manyworlds/>

-MWI: Multiple Worlds Interpretation

**The reason for adopting the MWI is that it avoids the collapse of the quantum wave.** (Other non-collapse theories are not better than MWI for various reasons, e.g., nonlocality of Bohmian mechanics; and the disadvantage of all of them is that they have some additional structure.) **The collapse postulate is a physical law that differs from all known physics in two aspects: it is genuinely random and it involves some kind of action at a distance**. According to the collapse postulate the outcome of a **quantum experiment is not determined by the initial conditions** of the Universe prior to the experiment: **only the probabilities are governed by the initial state**. Moreover, Bell 1964 has shown that there cannot be a compatible local-variables theory that will make deterministic predictions**. There is no experimental evidence in favor of collapse and against the MWI.**

#### [4] What the neg reads doesn’t prove the aff false but only challenges an assumption of it

#### [5] All neg interps are counter interps since the aff takes an implicit stance on every issue

### 1AC – Underview [Theory]

#### [1] 1ar theory since the neg can do infinite bad things and I can’t check. The 1NC can’t set paradigm issues for 1AR theory – it should be contextual

#### [2] Permissibility and presumption substantively affirm: a) Statements are true before false since if I told you my name, you’d believe me b) Interpretation – The negative must grant the aff presumption or permissibility. A violation would be reading both or contesting one [1] Strat skew – otherwise it incentivizes the 1n to read multiple NIBs and frontload the 1n with presumption and permissibility offense which is particularly bad since there isn’t a substantive truth to either side

#### [3] No omissions: All neg theory violations and kritik links must come from the text of the AC, not the absence of specification. (A) I have a limited time to speak so it’s an infinite aff burden (B) Race to bottom – incentivizes people to not engage the aff and make a bunch frivolous spec argument to preclude

#### [4] Neg may only read 1 T or theory shell. Multiple shells spread out the 1AR and allow the 2NR to collapse to whichever shell was under covered, meaning I wasn’t given a fair shot at justifying my practice. Multiple rounds solve your offense since we can check lots of abusive practices over time.

#### [5] Aff gets RVIs a) time skew: theory moots all aff offense and the 1ar isn’t enough time to win on both substance and theory so the 2n collapse makes it impossible, and given bidirectional interps, theory is always a 2nd off strategy for you

#### [6] The Negative has won more rounds at this tournament, and wins more rounds overall, so the affirmative is justified in being unfair insofar as it balances out side bias B) contesting aff spikes is incoherent because there’s infinite framing we can have but default aff because it stops regression c) theory on spikes is paradoxical because both of them equally indict each other

#### [7] Aff theory comes lexically prior A) affirming is harder so we need an advantage B) otherwise they can collapse to one shell for 6 minutes in the 2NR and not even touch mine, aff theory coming first forces them to clash with theory C) they have 13 minutes that they can spend on theory and I only have 7 so Aff theory must come first to check back time skew