## Frwk

#### The aff should be topical.

#### “Resolved:” refers to a legislative debate.

Louisiana State Legislature 16, “Glossary of Legislative Terms,” http://www.legis.state.la.us/glossary2.htm

Resolution: A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. (Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11, 13.1, 6.8, and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

#### The World Trade Organization is an international body that governs trade.

Tarver 21 (Evan Tarver has 6+ years of experience in financial analysis and 5+ years as an author, editor, and copywriter, “World Trade Organization”, Mar 1, 2021, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/w/wto.asp)

Created in 1995, the World Trade Organization (WTO) is an international institution that oversees the global trade rules among nations. It superseded the 1947 [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/g/gatt.asp) (GATT) created in the wake of World War II.

#### Reduce means to make smaller.

Cambridge Dictionary ND (https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/reduce)

to [become](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/become) or to make something [become](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/become) [smaller](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/small) in [size](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/size), [amount](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/amount), [degree](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/degree), [importance](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/importance), etc…

#### Intellectual property protection means protection for creative inventions.

UpCounsel 20 (Law journal, June 23, 2020,https://www.upcounsel.com/intellectual-property-protection)

Intellectual Property Protection is protection for inventions, literary and artistic works, symbols, names, and images created by the mind.

#### Medicines are a treatment for illness of injury

Cambridge Dictionary ND (https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/reduce)

[treatment](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/treatment) for [illness](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/illness) or [injury](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/injury).

#### [1] Competitive equity—any alternative wrecks it—it’s impossible to negate alternative frameworks with the ground allocated to us by the parameters of the resolution—all 1AR defense to this claim will rely on concessionary ground which isn’t a stable basis for a year of debate.

#### They don’t get to weigh the aff – it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it.

#### [2] Switch Side Debate – read your stuff on the neg which non-uniques your offense and is net better since a Kritik on the neg has to be tailored to the aff– otherwise your discussion starts and ends at the 1AC.

#### [3] Refinement – a well-defined resolution is critical to allow the neg to refute the aff in an in-depth fashion. This process of negation produces iterative testing and improvement. Only a resolution with ground on both sides allows for the most clash which controls the internal link to education. Committees outweigh because they discuss the best topic for a stasis point – even if some resolutions are bad it is net better for a group to create a topic rather than an individual.

#### [4] TVA – defend the reduction of IP for a medicine that primarily affects Asian communities

#### B] Defend the reduction of IP for Asian based medicines in response to covid to reverse the racism direct at Asians after covid

#### C] Defend the reduction of IP for covid based medicines with offense as to how it helps reduce anti Asian violence

#### [5] Truth testing—they moot the role of the negative which is to force the aff to defend their core assumptions—allowing affs to reframe the debate around their terms makes engagement impossible—outweighs and turns the aff because clash is the only way to translate anything debate gives us outside of the activity.

#### T isn’t violent – A] I don’t have the power to impose a norm – only to convince you my side is better. T doesn’t ban you from the activity – the whole point is that norms should be contestable – I just say make a better arg next time. B] Exclusion is inevitable – every role of the ballot excludes some arguments and even saying T bad excludes it – that means we should delineate ground along reciprocal lines, not abandon division altogether. Reading T isn’t psychic violence – that was above, but especially if we’re not going for it since reading T can be used to prevent aff shiftiness and make substance a viable option.

#### No silencing DA - T is just like a disad or critique we’ve said a certain practice the aff took was bad and it would’ve been better had they done it differently not that they are bad debaters – just like the cap k says the aff engaged in some practice that reinforced capitalism and it would’ve been better if they had emphasized Marxism – impositions in some form are inevitable because the negative has the burden of rejoinder and needs link arguments – every disad link says the aff did something wrong and theres an implicit version of the aff that wouldn’t have linked

#### Theory before the K – A] Prior question. My theory argument calls into question the ability to run the argument in the first place. They can’t say the same even if they criticize theory because theory makes rules of the game not just normative statements about what debaters should say. B] Fair testing. Judge their arguments knowing I wasn’t given a fair shot to answer them. Prefer theory takes out K because they could answer my arguments, but I couldn’t answer theirs. Without testing their args, we don’t know if they’re valid, so you prefer fairness impacts on strength of link. Impact turns any critical education since a marketplace of ideas where we innovate, and test ideas presumes equal access.

## Case

### OV – Tricks

#### New 2NR responses to auto affirm args and theory, a) forcing us to answer every warrant in the 1nc means we can’t develop as much offense and implications of these args are unkown.

#### aReject auto affirm arguments, a) dropping one blip means its game over which means we don’t get the debate over the aff which they think is valuable, b) turns their offense – don’t let them kick out of these args. It’s a reason to drop them and a perf con – they reify the nature of tricky debate which is excatly what upholds the debate space. Think about how many times white debaters read stuff like eval after 1NC vs minorities to escape discussions

#### Even if it’s a good model the judge shouldn’t endorse it, results in guilt politics where the judge does nothing but believes they participate, this leads to broader exported violence in everyday life. Paints suffering as vote for us to remedy, assuages the judge of guilt bc of indivual actions when they have in fact done nothing

#### Any arg that defines what indivuals can read or how they engage based on race is causes authenticiy testing. Begs the question of who is asian enough and people pretending to be asian, this causes physic violenc and turns their violence posited in the 1AC. They violate, said im violent by showing up bc im anti asian

#### Paternalism DA- they deny the possibillity for a legit victory- voting aff doesn’t remedy strucutral harms, you recreate the logic of paternalism where people feel they are helping asian debaters and reproduces stereotypes that asian debaters can only win on race based arguments

#### Args in round cant remedy structural fairness, only procedural fairnes, a ballot for me can signal my inabillity to debate in this round but doesn’t solve racism.

#### Even if they win that Asian people are oppressed in society or in debate it doesn’t mean hack for them, there is no conception as to how much fairness in round you need to destroy to give them reperations and any sort of calculus such as that is obviously reductionist and problematic which means none of their arguments can have an implication

### A2 ROB

#### ROB causes oppression Olympics – you say center anti Asian violence, someone else says center anti black violence, the only way to resolve them is to have an oppression Olympics debate

#### ROB should be to vote for the better debater – anything else is arbitrary and self serving

#### Your ROB card DOES NOT say what you claim it does, it says oppression has existed against Asian americans not that within the debate space this has to be the ROB

### tAT: Debate Bad

#### 1] Trying to eliminate debate produces cruel optimism and repetition compulsion because they target discriminatory acts produced by the state at large i.e debate, instead of the structure itself. Turns the case – causes endless repetitious targeting of smaller structures never destroying the structure itself and ensuring the failure of the 1ac’s project.

#### 2] Even if debate is bad it can tactically be used to teach Asian people their correct positioning in the world so they can approach the world without investing hope in it – the alternative is not learning this position and investing hope in everything which recreates cruel optimism and turns the case.

#### 3] Debate is good, double bind either the AC performance is strong enough to destroy debate which should have been done x bids ago or the Ac’s performance doesn’t have anything to prove which means the squo is quite strong and that causes presumption.

### Presumption

#### Presumption negates against k affs – they can choose any advocacy it’s their burden to prove it does stuff.

#### Vote neg on presumption

#### [1] They have no intrinsic benefit to specifically reading the aff within the debate space and thus no reason to affirm their strategy

#### [2] Movements don’t spill up – competition means you ally yourself with people who vote for you and alienate those who are forced to debate you ensuring the failure of the movement

#### [3] The regurgitation of knowledge from the 1ac proves that it is not a departure from the status quo, but rather gets coopted by academia

### AT: Eng and Han 1

#### 1] Specific to the classroom – debate isn’t that it’s a competitive activity.

#### 2] The card doesn’t say anything about all communication being bad – the ev just says language is exploited in a bad way and certain dialects are deemed as good but that doesn’t mean communication as a whole is bad.

#### 3] C/a the no solvency argument – targeting debate recreates cruel optimism.

### AT: Eng and Han 2

#### 1] Just says the state does messed up stuff all the time not that these spaces are built that way or can never change. Don’t auto affirm – relies on you winning your aff is good and does stuff also proves our ballot claim – you’re clearly attached .

### Case – Chambers-Letson 1

#### You fall prey to coercive mimeticism insofar as you have tried to stipulate what an “Asian” subject is thru your theory of power and defined militant preservation as an Asian advocacy. BUT our model of debate solves by redefining the Asian as a contextual construct thru multiple conciousnesses.

#### The aff's sentimental politics promises that empathetic identification with the suffering Asian body via the ballot creates uplift and emancipation thru a “recognition” of exclusion. This creates passivity and relies on an economy of redemption where the presentation of suffering simplifies the subject into a hateful image, sanctioning further violence and coercive mimeticism.

**Berlant, 8** **(Lauren Berlant, George M. Pullman Professor of English and Chair of the Lesbian and Gay Studies Project at the University of Chicago, 2008, accessed on 1-11-2021, *The Female Complaint: The Unfinished Business of Sentimentality in American Culture*, "Poor Eliza", http://library.lol/main/2DD3D18490A01AC7C631407842AB003F) //lex dy**

What distinguishes these critical texts are the startling ways they struggle to encounter the Uncle Tom form without reproducing it, declining to pay the inheritance tax. The countersentimental does not involve the aesthetic destruction of the contract sentimentality makes between its texts and readers, that proper reading will lead to more virtuous, compassionate feeling and therefore to a better self. What changes is the place of repetition in this contract, a crisis frequently thematized in formal aesthetic and generational terms. In its traditional and political modalities, the sentimental promises that in a just world an expressive consensus would already exist about what constitutes material uplift, amelioration, emancipation, and those other horizons toward which empathy directs itself. Identification with suffering, the ethical response to the sentimental plot, leads to some version of a mimetic repetition in the audience and thus to a generally held view about what transformations would bring the good life into being. The presumption that the terms of consent are transhistorical, translocal, and transdifferential because true feeling is shared explains in part why emotions, especially painful ones, are so central to the world-building aspects of sentimental alliance. Countersentimental texts withdraw from the contract that presumes consent with the conventionally desired outcomes of identification and compassion. What about the democratic pleasures of anonymity and alterity, let alone sovereign individuality? Is sentimentality ultimately antisovereign, a discipline of the body toward assuming universal response? Such desires as those for a felt unconflictedness might well motivate the sacrifice of surprising thought on behalf of the emotional normativity of the sentimental world, as though there is not a political economy to the meaning of emotions that bridge inequalities, such as compassion and love. What, if anything, can be built from diverse knowledges and experiences of the pain of nondominant peoples? How can one desire to refuse the enmeshment of one’s story about the humiliations of history with the conventions of narrative suffering while being true to the facts and affects of ordinary subordination? Disinheriting without disavowing requires foregrounding ambivalence, as we will see. More than a critique of human empathic attachment as such, the countersentimental modality challenges the place literature and storytelling have come to stand for in the normalization of gestures of emotional humanism in the United States across a span of almost two centuries. Three moments in this genealogy, which differ as much from each other as from the credulous citation of Uncle Tom’s Cabin we saw in The King and I and Dimples, will mark here some potential within the archive that counters the repetitive compulsions of sentimentality. I cite these resistances and refusals not to side with claims about the immoral “aridity” of sentimental politics but to provide evidence of the kinds of ambivalence that the “liberal paternalism” of sentimentality engenders in those whom its aesthetic has spoken about, to, and for in ways that completely confuse definitions of the human and the inhuman.23 This essay begins with a famous passage from James Baldwin’s “Everybody’s Protest Novel,” a much cited essay about Uncle Tom’s Cabin that is rarely read in the strong sense because the powerful language of rageful truth telling it uses would want to shame in advance any desire to make claims for the tactical efficacy of suffering and mourning in the struggle to transform the United States into a counterracist nation. Baldwin’s claim is that associating the human with the suffering actually limits the human to a mode of absolute passivity that, ethically, cannot embody the human in its fullness. Baldwin’s engagement with Stowe in this essay comes amid a general wave of protest novels, social problem films, and film noir in the United States after World War II: Gentleman’s Agreement, The Postman Always Rings Twice, The Best Years of Our Lives. Works like these, he says, “emerge for what they are: a mirror of our confusion, dishonesty, panic, trapped and immobilized in the sunlit prison of the American dream.”24 They cut the complexity of human motives and self-understanding “down to size” by preferring “a lie more palatable than the truth” about the social and material effects the liberal pedagogy of optimism has, or doesn’t have, on “man’s” capacity to produce a world of authentic truth, justice, and freedom.25 “Truth” is the central keyword for Baldwin. He defines it as “a devotion to the human being, his freedom and fulfillment: freedom which cannot be legislated, fulfillment which cannot be charted.”26 Stowe’s totalitarian religiosity, in contrast, her insistence that subjects “bargain” for heavenly redemption with their own physical and spiritual mortification, sanctions the fundamental abjection of all persons, especially the black ones who wear the dark night of the soul out where all can see it. Additionally, Baldwin argues that Uncle Tom’s Cabin instantiates a tradition of locating the destiny of the nation in a false model of the individual soul, one imagined as free of ambivalence, aggression, or contradiction. In contrast, by advocating for the “human being” he means to repudiate stock identities as such, arguing that the stark simplicity of the icon, type, or cliché confirms the very fantasies and institutions against which the sentimental is ostensibly being mobilized. This national/liberal refusal of complexity is what he elsewhere calls “the price of the ticket” for membership in the American dream: as the Uncle Tom films suggest, whites need blacks to “dance” for them so that they might continue disavowing the costs or ghosts of whiteness, which involve religious traditions of self-loathing and cultural traditions confusing happiness with analgesia.27 The conventional reading of “Everybody’s Protest Novel” sees it as a violent rejection of the sentimental.28 Sentimentality is associated with the feminine (Little Women), with hollow and dishonest uses of feeling (Uncle Tom’s Cabin), and with an aversion to the real pain that real experience brings. “Causes, as we know, are notoriously bloodthirsty,” he writes: the politico-sentimental novel uses suffering vampirically to simplify the subject, thereby making the injunction to compassion safe for the consumer of the suffering spectacle.29 But it turns out that there is more to the story. In “Everybody’s Protest Novel” Baldwin bewails the sentimentality of Richard Wright’s Native Son too, because Bigger Thomas is not the homeopathic other to Uncle Tom after all, but one of his “children,”30 the heir to his negative legacy. Both Tom and Thomas live in a simple relation to violence and die only knowing slightly more than they did before they were sacrificed to a white ideal of the soul’s simple purity, its emptiness. This addiction to the formula of redemption through violent simplification

#### The 1AC's clamor for space within debate falls prey to coercive mimeticism, producing institutionalized self-hatred – turns case.

**Nyong'o, 14** **(Tavia Nyong'o, Professor of American Studies at Yale University, 2014, accessed on 12-23-2020, *The Black Scholar: Journal of Black Studies and Research*, "Unburdening Representation", https://sci-hub.se/https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00064246.2014.11413689) \*square brackets in original, curly brackets for gendered language //lex dy**

I concur with English when he observes that "old discursive practices and symbolic structures ... need updating from time to time." This updating, I would note, has less to do with accommodating anything like progress than it has to do with reframing oppositional strategies in the face of eve-revolving modes of intransigence. The inauthenticity of the fabulist is of particular value on this score, insofar as ~~his or her~~ {their} speech is not contained by a correspondence to its particular context, but carries over concepts, percepts, and affects from one regime of representation into another in a manner that is neither up-to-date nor out-of-date but truly untimely. One could give here as an example Jason Holliday's superannuated camp antics-already dated in 1967 and hardly a "positive image" for black gay men in our post-Stonewall era-acts and gestures that nevertheless contain within themselves an internal differentiation from their own times that never ceases to fascinate and, in so fascinating, to inspire other acts of imagining life otherwise. If the powers of the false supply one reliable ingredient to the transformation of character-to the making over of black bodies into "canvases of representation," as Stuart Hall puts it-it is in the relief it provides from the anxiety produced by the quixotic search for an authentic relation to an inauthentic and oppressive world. 13 III. One way of articulating the way Afrofabulation can respond to English's call to update our philosophical norms is in relation to what Rey Chow has termed "coercive mimeticism." Discussing how the politics of representation have evolved in the era of conservative multiculturalism, Chow has noted: Such politics may, as I have been arguing, be designated by the phrase "coercive mimeticism," a general cross-ethnic mechanism that provides the connection among otherwise disjointed events such as the pedagogical cultivation and circulation of arcane cultural knowledge; the activist clamor for institutional space