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#### Interpretation: “medicines” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend WTO member nations reducing intellectual property protections for a subset of medicines.

#### The upward entailment test and adverb test determine the genericity of a bare plural

Leslie and Lerner 16 [Sarah-Jane Leslie, Ph.D., Princeton, 2007. Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. Served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University. Adam Lerner, PhD Philosophy, Postgraduate Research Associate, Princeton 2018. From 2018, Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow in the Center for Bioethics at New York University. Member of the [Princeton Social Neuroscience Lab](http://psnlab.princeton.edu/).] “Generic Generalizations.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. April 24, 2016. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/> TG

1. Generics and Logical Form

In English, generics can be expressed using a variety of syntactic forms: bare plurals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), indefinite singulars (e.g., “a tiger is striped”), and definite singulars (“the tiger is striped”). However, none of these syntactic forms is dedicated to expressing generic claims; each can also be used to express existential and/or specific claims. Further, some generics express what appear to be generalizations over individuals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), while others appear to predicate properties directly of the kind (e.g., “dodos are extinct”). These facts and others give rise to a number of questions concerning the logical forms of generic statements.

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), some individual tiger in ([2b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex2b)), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in ([3b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex3b))—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.

The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with “some” with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology “existential reading”. The application of the term “existential interpretation” is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a kind.

There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, “tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) does not entail that animals are striped, but ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.)

#### It applies to “medicines” – 1] upward entailment test – “reduce intellectual property protections for medicines” doesn’t entail reducing protections for substances, because it imply reducing IP on crops, 2] adverb test – member nations “ought to usually reduce intellectual property protections for medicines” doesn’t substantially change resolutional meaning

#### Precision is an independent voter and outweighs – a) jurisdiction – the judge is contractually obligated to vote affirmative if the rez is proven true they can’t vote aff if you aren’t defending it, b) outweighs – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits – you can pick anything from COVID vaccines to HIV/AIDS to random biotech to insulin treatments and there’s no universal disad since each one has a different function and implication for health, tech, and relations – explodes neg prep and leads to random medicine of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible. PICs don’t solve – it’s absurd to say neg potential abuse justifies the aff being flat out not T, which leads to a race towards abuse. Limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep.

#### 2] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff.

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate.

#### Drop the debater – because you skewed the entire round. Deters future abuse

#### Competing interps – a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm. b] it creates a race to the top so we set the best norms

#### No RVIs – a) RVIs incentivize baiting T and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices and creates a chilling effect where people don’t check real abuse. B) logic – you shouldn’t win by proving you’re topical

#### T before 1AR theory – A) Norms – we only have a couple months to set T norms but can set 1AR theory norms any time B) Magnitude – it impacts a larger portion of the round since the aff advocacy determines every speech after it

#### NC theory highest layer– A] norming – we have more speeches to develop it B] I had to be abusive because you were first

## 2

#### Interp: If the aff specifies a role of the judge, they must, in a delineated text in the 1AC, clarify BOTH a) how we determine what a legitimate advocacy is and how offense links back to the role of the ballot, and b) whether or not the aff comes before theory.

#### Violation:

#### Vote neg for engagement – I can’t read turns or a counter advocacy if I don’t know how to garner offense which turns the aff into a NIB that I have to frame out of – also means I can’t determine whether I should read spec or T since they could weigh case – flips their offense since a) we don’t engage with the pedagogical value of their ROB, and b) replaces clash with two ships passing in the night which is a resolvability voter for the judge equitably deciding the round. Also skews my strat since I can’t formulate an NC with multiple offensive outs and even if I do the 1AR can spin out of offense which incentivizes shifty 1ACs that skirt clash and prevent me from checking their abuse.

#### ONLY EVALUATE THE COUNTER-INTERP: No cross-apps, overviews, meta theory, etc – otherwise it justifies them getting away with infinite abuse since they knew they wouldn’t be able to defend the CI and prep out other ways to take out or uplayer the shell – and it doesn’t defend them getting a good norm

## 3

#### Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than the whole resolution then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC.

#### Standards:

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

#### a) Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides.

#### b) Shiftiness-Having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things.

#### 2. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Having one also encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.

#### Procedural fairness first—a) it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game proven by wins, losses and speaker points which proves its inescapable b) probability – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but it can rectify skews which means the only impact to a ballot is fairness and deciding who wins, c] it internal link turns the aff – your role of the ballot is to perpetuate discussion but unfairness means the debate turns into a one sided monologue.

## 4

#### The role of the ballot and RoJ is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement– anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – other frameworks collapse since you must say it is true.

#### Theory is coherent and all offense links as long as it proves the resolution true or false.

#### Prefer,

#### 1] Constituitivism – The topic is given to us to debate by the topic comitee and five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true. These are the only roles we have going into the round which means the judge only has the jurisdiction to vote on arguments that prove the truth or falsity of the resolution.

#### 2] Inclusion – Any offense functions under truth testing but hyperspecific RoBs exclude all other discussion and hurt underpriveledged debaters that don’t have the resources to engage in those arguments.

## 5

#### Permissibility and presumption Negate,

#### 1] Text – Ought is defined as expressing obligation[[3]](#footnote-3) which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since the aff can’t prove an obligation. O/W since text is the only thing we have access to prior to the round.

#### 2] Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.

#### 3] Real world – Policymakers don’t pass policies they aren’t sure about, they shelve them for later.

#### 1] Is ought gap – ethics can only point to features of what something is not why that ought to be the case, only through using the function or purpose of an actor to determine its obligations can we bridge the gap and determine whether something is good or bad, Stilley 10

Shalina Stilley, August 2010, “Natural Law Theory and the "Is"--"Ought" Problem: A Critique of Four Solutions”, Marquette University https://epublications.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1059&context=dissertations\_mu

In his article ―Good and Evil, Geach attempts to establish that it is not possible to understand what a ―good human being is without first understanding the essence of the human being. 190 He begins by distinguishing between attributive and predicative adjectives. An example of the former is the word ―small in the sentence: ―Bruno is a small lagomorph. An example of the latter is the word ―red in the sentence: ―This is a red book. Although it is possible to know whether an object is red without knowing what it is, this is not the case with attributive adjectives such as ―small. In order to determine whether a lagomorph that is three inches long is ―small, one must know what a lagomorph is. It is only when we know that a lagomorph is a rabbit that we can intelligently answer the question ―Is Bruno, who is three inches tall, a small lagomorph? With this distinction as a backdrop, Geach asserts that the terms ―good and ―bad are attributive adjectives. In order to know if a knife is good, we must know what a knife is, that is, we must know its function, essence, or final cause. Once we know that a knife‘s function is to cut things, we can determine whether a particular knife is ―good. If a given knife is capable of fulfilling its function, it is good; if not, it is bad. Likewise, in order know if a particular person is good, we must know what a person is. Geach‘s claim here is that unless we know the function, essence, or telos of the human person—or human nature—we cannot determine whether a given person is good. His claim is also that once we know the function or telos of the human person, it is possible to know what people ought to do in order to be ―good. Particular humans who fulfill their function— or who are in the process of doing so—are ―good, and those who do not are ―bad. With this distinction between attributive and predicative adjectives as a backdrop, Geach is able to substantiate his conclusion that although the term ―good does not satisfy one specific condition and does not have one set definition, it is not—as Moore claims—a hopelessly ambiguous term. In some cases the term ―good might mean ―pleasurable, in another, it might mean something else, but it does not follow that it is therefore an indefinable, non-natural attribute. The meaning of good in the phrase ―good knife does not correspond to the same set of properties as it does when used in the phrase ―good human being. Nor does the meaning of ―small in the phrase ―small egg correspond to the same height as it does when used in the phrase ―small elephant. Nevertheless, neither the term ―good nor ―small are hopelessly ambiguous or altogether indefinable. Moore claims that ―good expresses an indefinable, non-natural property. Geach responds by pointing out that, regardless of the way the term is used, it corresponds to the fulfillment of the function, essence, or telos of the object which it specifies. Although Geach is not concerned explicitly with the term ―ought, his claim here is relevant to the IOP insofar as both ―good and ―ought are normative. If it is possible to grasp what a ―good human being is by considering human nature and the function of the human person, it will be possible to grasp what humans ought to do. What humans ought to do in this scheme is fulfill their function qua human beings. Although Geach is primarily concerned with the naturalistic fallacy and the term ―good, his insights are relevant to questions about the Ought and the IOP. If it is possible to bridge the fact value gap of the naturalistic fallacy by returning to a functional notion of things in general and human beings in particular, presumably it would be possible to bridge the Is—Ought gap by the same method. If it is possible to derive a ―good from facts about human nature, and if the Ought relies on the notion of the good, it will be possible to derive an ―ought from such facts.

#### “Ought” therefore expresses proper functionality, the resolution says nothing about the universal moral value of reducing intellectual property protections but is rather a question of whether intellectual property is necessary to the form of the WTO.

#### Thus the standard is consistency with the function of agents,

#### Prefer:

#### [1] We follow rules like speech times because that is the purpose and structure of debate. Their very performance justifies the NC framework and proves the AC collapses to the NC

#### [2] Consequentialism fails – A] Induction fails –saying that induction works relies on induction itself because it assumes that past trends will continue, which means it’s circular and unjustified B] Butterfly effect - every action has infinite stemming consequences so it is impossible to evaluate an action based off them; one government policy could end up causing nuclear war in a million years.

#### [3] Actor specificity – states are not moral entities but derive authority from doctrines which explain there purpose.

#### Negate:

#### 1] TRIPS is normal means for the plan, WTO

World Trade Organization, xx-xx-xxxx, “TRIPS — Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights" No Publication, <https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/trips_e/trips_e.htm>

TRIPS — Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights The WTO Agreement on **Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights** (TRIPS) is the most comprehensive multilateral agreement on intellectual property (IP). It plays a central role in facilitating trade in knowledge and creativity, in resolving trade disputes over IP, and in assuring WTO members the latitude to achieve their domestic policy objectives. It frames the IP system in terms of innovation, technology transfer and public welfare. The Agreement is a legal recognition of the significance of links between IP and trade and the need for a balanced IP system.

#### 2] TRIPS was designed with the purpose of enforcing IP protections, Yu 09

Peter K. Yu, 12-2009, “The Objectives and Principles of the TRIPS Agreement”, https://scholarship.law.tamu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1456&context=facscholar#:~:text=In%20order%20to%20reduce%20the,themselves%20become%20barriers%20to%20legitimate

This section provided the foundation for establishing a new multilateral intellectual property agreement, which eventually became the TRIPS Agreement. Included in the negotiations were four main issues: (1) substantive standards or norms of IPR [intellectual property right] protection; (2) procedures under national law for the enforcement of IPR protection; (3) dispute settlement procedures between parties to any eventual agreement on TRIPs; (4) the relationship between GATT and other relevant international organizations, including WIPO, concerning TRIPs and the relationship between an eventual agreement in the Uruguay Round and the existing intellectual property conventions.' 3

#### 3] your inherency proves

## 6

#### Drug innovation is high—Prefer our study it’s analyzes the past decade and is from one of the most trusted leaders in innovation information, Clarivate 9-15

[[Clarivate Plc](https://c212.net/c/link/?t=0&l=en&o=3290353-1&h=1934425780&u=https%3A%2F%2Fc212.net%2Fc%2Flink%2F%3Ft%3D0%26l%3Den%26o%3D2991820-1%26h%3D1150240617%26u%3Dhttp%253A%252F%252Fwww.clarivate.com%252F%26a%3DClarivate%2BPlc&a=Clarivate+Plc), (NYSE:[CLVT](https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/2021-centre-for-medicines-research-cmr-pharmaceutical-rd-factbook-from-clarivate-finds-drug-approvals-at-a-10-year-high-despite-the-challenges-of-covid-19-301376948.html#financial-modal)), a global leader in providing trusted information and insights to accelerate the pace of innovation, today announced the release of the [2021 Centre for Medicines Research (CMR) International Pharmaceutical R&D Factbook](https://c212.net/c/link/?t=0&l=en&o=3290353-1&h=2854804820&u=https%3A%2F%2Fclarivate.com%2Finnovation-exchange%2Fsolution%2Fcmr-international-pharmaceutical-rd-factbook%2F%3Fcampaignname%3DCMR_RD_Factbook_Ecommerce_LS_Global_2021%26campaignid%3D7014N000001YTVM%26utm_campaign%3DCMR_RD_Factbook_Ecommerce_LS_Global_2021%26utm_source%3Dearned_coverage%26utm_medium%3Dpress&a=2021+Centre+for+Medicines+Research%C2%A0(CMR)+International+Pharmaceutical+R%26D+Factbook)., 9-15-2021, "2021 Centre for Medicines Research (CMR) Pharmaceutical R&amp;D Factbook from Clarivate Finds Drug Approvals at a 10-year High Despite the Challenges of COVID-19", No Publication, https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/2021-centre-for-medicines-research-cmr-pharmaceutical-rd-factbook-from-clarivate-finds-drug-approvals-at-a-10-year-high-despite-the-challenges-of-covid-19-301376948.html, date accessed 9-15-2021] //Lex AT

COVID impact1 Amid a global pandemic as the world has shone a spotlight on the industry's COVID-19 vaccine and therapeutic development race, biopharma companies have been anxious to see how COVID-19 could impact R&D. From the CMR Factbook we can infer that there has been no major impact from COVID-19 on the R&D pipeline thus far. While it typically takes a drug two to three years to transition through a clinical phase, the longer-term impact remains to be seen. 2020 saw a 10-year high for NME launches indicating that COVID-19 did not negatively impact drug R&D. There were 59 NMEs launched in 2020 as compared to 31 in 2011 and 46 in 2019. The pandemic did not impact drug development times as they have stayed relatively constant from 2019 to 2020 at 10.5 and 10.4 years respectively. Approval times for FDA, EMA, and PMDA remained stable despite the pandemic: The FDA took on average 244 days in 2020 as compared to 243 in 2019. The EMA took on average 426 days in 2020 as compared to 423 in 2019. The PDMA took on average 313 days in 2020 as compared to 304 in 2019. Industry innovation2 In addition to pandemic-related impacts, now more than ever, biopharma companies are focused on truly innovative and differentiated therapies. According to 2020 FDA approvals, 58% were for rare indications while 68% were granted at least one regulatory designation: breakthrough, fast-track, accelerated, or priority. Both these points put together suggest that biopharma is increasingly focusing on innovative and differentiated therapies. TNF alpha ligand was the most popular target in 2020 with 69 companies actively researching the area. 3 These innovative therapies are mainly being researched by emerging biopharma companies rather than top 30 innovators. Of the 69 companies researching the TNF alpha ligand, only three of them are top 30 innovators. 4

#### The biopharmaceutical industry is uniquely reliant on IP protections – undermining them would kill innovation by making an already expensive process completely unfeasible.

Kristina M. Lybecker, PhD, 17 [PhD Economics, Associate Professor of Economics @ Colorado College], “Intellectual Property Rights Protection and the Biopharmaceutical Industry: How Canada Measures Up,” Fraser Institute, January 2017, <https://www.fraserinstitute.org/sites/default/files/intellectual-property-rights-protection-and-the%20biopharmaceutical-industry.pdf> C.VC

The unique structure of the innovative biopharmaceutical industry necessitates a variety of intellectual property protection mechanisms. In particular, the industry is characterized by a research and development (R&D) process that is lengthy, expensive, uncertain, and risky. According to DiMasi and colleagues, the estimated cost of developing a new medicine is US$2.6 billion (DiMasi, Grabowski, and Hansen, 2016).2 In addition, the time required to develop a new drug is also significant, averaging 10 to 15 years without any guarantee of success (PhRMA, n.d.). While these figures are highly controversial, biopharmaceutical innovation is unquestionably an expensive and lengthy undertaking.3 For the biopharmaceutical industry, innovation and its protection are essential and the source of both profits and growth. As such, patent protection is disproportionally more important for ensuring that the innovator appropriates the returns to R&D for the biopharmaceutical industry than virtually any other. Extending the findings of the 1987 “Yale Survey” (Levin, Klevorick, Nelson, and Winter, 1987), the “Carnegie Mellon Survey” established that while patents are again considered “unambiguously the least effective appropriability mechanisms,” the drug industry and other scholars regard them as strictly more effective than alternative mechanisms (Cohen, Nelson, and Walsh, 1996). The industry’s disproportionate reliance on patents and other forms of intellectual property protection is confirmed in numerous other studies.4

#### 50% of medicine comes from IK

Eiland 08 [Dr. Eiland received a doctorate in Oriental Archaeology from Oxford University and an LLM from the Munich Intellectual Property Law Center], “Patenting Traditional Medicine”, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG, pg. 7-10, 2008 //SLC PK

* TM = traditional medicine

In 1982, it was estimated that about 50 % of all filled prescriptions in the US originated from drugs that were derived – one way or another – from natural substances. This generated US sales of about 20 billion.4 Another estimate found that 3/4 of the plants used in prescription drugs originally came to the attention of drug companies because of their use in TM.5 In 1995, the worldwide market value of TM derived pharmaceuticals was estimated to be $43 billon.6 While one could argue about the precise values, TM has significant pharmaceutical applications. Drug companies are interested in acquiring TM, both natural substances, as well as the knowledge about how to use them.

#### Pharma innovation solves disease – that prevents extinction

Engelhardt 8 – PhD, MD, Professor of Philosophy @ Rice (Hugo, “Innovation and the Pharmaceutical Industry: Critical Reflections on the Virtues of Profit,” EBrary)

Many are suspicious of, or indeed jealous of, the good fortune of others. Even when profit is gained in the market without fraud and with the consent of all buying and selling goods and services, there is a sense on the part of some that something is wrong if considerable profit is secured. There is even a sense that good fortune in the market, especially if it is very good fortune, is unfair. One might think of such rhetorically disparaging terms as "wind-fall profits". There is also a suspicion of the pursuit of profit because it is often embraced not just because of the material benefits it sought, but because of the hierarchical satisfaction of being more affluent than others. The pursuit of profit in the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries is tor many in particular morally dubious because it is acquired from those who have the bad fortune to be diseased or disabled. Although the suspicion of profit is not well-founded, this suspicion is a major moral and public-policy challenge. Profit in the market for the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries is to be celebrated. This is the case, in that if one is of the view (1) that the presence of additional resources for research and development spurs innovation in the development of pharmaceuticals and med-ical devices (i.e., if one is of the view that the allure of profit is one of the most effective ways not only to acquire resources but productively to direct human energies in their use), (2) that given the limits of altruism and of the willingness of persons to be taxed, the possibility of profits is necessary to secure such resources, (3) that the allure of profits also tends to enhance the creative use of available resources in the pursuit of phar-maceutical and medical-device innovation, and (4) if one judges it to be the case that such innovation is both necessary to maintain the human species in an ever-changing and always dangerous environment in which new microbial and other threats may at any time emerge to threaten human well-being, if not survival (i.e., that such innovation is necessary to prevent increases in morbidity and mortality risks), as well as (5) in order generally to decrease morbidity and mortality risks in the future, it then follows (6) that one should be concerned regarding any policies that decrease the amount of resources and energies available to encourage such innovation. One should indeed be of the view that the possibilities for profit, all things being equal, should be highest in the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries. Yet, there is a suspicion regarding the pursuit of profit in medicine and especially in the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries.

#### Extinction ow – A] consent, B] reversibility

#### Their extinction arg isn’t wrong indigenous ppl are alive in the squo which means ours ow on reversibility.

#### Extinction isn’t white paranoia and apocalyptic reps are good

Thompson 18 [Nicole Akoukou. Chicago-based creative writer. 4-6-2018. "Why I will not allow the fear of a nuclear attack to be white-washed." RaceBaitR. http://racebaitr.com/2018/04/06/2087/#]

I couldn’t spare empathy for a white woman whose biggest fear was something that hadn’t happened yet and might not. Meanwhile, my most significant fears were in motion: women and men dying in cells after being wrongly imprisoned, choked out for peddling cigarettes, or shot to death during ‘routine’ traffic stops. I twitch when my partner is late, worried that a cantankerous cop has brutalized or shot him because he wouldn’t prostrate himself. As a woman of color, I am aware of the multiple types of violence that threaten me currently—not theoretically. Street harassment, excessively affecting me as a Black woman, has blindsided me since I was eleven. A premature body meant being catcalled before I’d discussed the birds and the bees. It meant being followed, whistled at, or groped. As an adult, while navigating through neighborhoods with extinguished street lights, I noticed the correlation between women’s safety and street lighting—as well as the fact that Black and brown neighborhoods were never as brightly lit as those with a more significant white population. I move quickly through those unlit spaces, never comforted by the inevitable whirl of red and blue sirens. In fact, it’s always been the contrary. Ever so often, cops approach me in their vehicle’s encouraging me to “Hurry along,” “Stay on the sidewalk,” or “Have a good night.” My spine stiffening, I never believed they endorsed my safety. Instead, I worried that I’d be accused of an unnamed accusation, corned by a cop who preys on Black women, or worse. A majority of my 50-minute bus ride from the southside of Chicago to the north to join these women for the birthday celebration was spent reading articles about citywide shootings. I began with a Chicago Tribute piece titled “33 people shot, seven fatally, in 13 hours,” then toppled into a barrage of RIP posts on Facebook and ended with angry posts about police brutality on Tumblr. You might guess, by the time I arrived to dinner I wasn’t in the mood for the “I can’t believe we’re all going to die because Trump is an idiot” shit. I shook my head, willing the meal to be over, and was grateful when the check arrived just as someone was asking me about my hair. My thinking wasn’t all too different from Michael Harriot’s ‘Why Black America Isn’t Worried About the Upcoming Nuclear Holocaust.” While the meal was partly pleasant, I departed thinking, “fear of nuclear demolition is just some white shit.” Sadly, that thought would not last long. I still vibe with Harriot’s statement, “Black people have lived under the specter of having our existence erased on a white man’s whim since we stepped onto the shore at Jamestown Landing.” However, a friend—a Black friend—ignited my nuclear paranoia by sharing theories about when it might happen and who faced the greatest threat. In an attempt to ease my friend’s fear, I leaned in to listen but accidentally toppled down the rabbit hole too. I forked through curated news feeds. I sifted through “fake news,” “actual news,” and foreign news sources. Suddenly, an idea took root: nuclear strike would disproportionately impact Black people, brown people, and low-income individuals. North Korea won’t target the plain sight racists of Portland, Oregon, the violently microaggressive liberals of the rural Northwest, or the white-hooded klansmen of Diamondhead, Mississippi. No, under the instruction of the supreme leader Kim Jong-un, North Korea will likely strike densely populated urban areas, such as Los Angeles, Chicago, Washington D.C., and New York City. These locations stand-out as targets for a nuclear strike because they are densely populated U.S. population centers. Attacking the heart of the nation or populous cities would translate to more casualties. With that in mind, it’s not lost on me that the most populous cities in the United States boast sizeable diverse populations, or more plainly put: Black populations. This shit stresses me out! There’s a creeping chill that follows me, a silent alarm that rings each time my Google alert chimes letting me know that Donald Trump has yet again provoked Kim Jong-Un, a man who allegedly killed his very own uncle. I’ve grown so pressed by the idea of nuclear holocaust that my partner and I started gathering non-perishables, candlesticks, a hand-crank radio, and other must-buy items that can be banked in a shopping cart. The practice of preparing for a nuclear holocaust sometimes feels comical, particularly when acknowledging that there has long been a war on Black people in this country. Blackness is bittersweet in flavor. We are blessed with the melanized skin, the MacGyver-like inventiveness of our foremothers, and our blinding brightness—but the anti-blackness that we experience is also blinding as well as stifling. We are stuck by rigged systems, punished with the prison industrial complex, housing discrimination, pay discrimination, and worse. We get side-eyes from strangers when we’re “loitering,” and the police will pull us over for driving “too fast” in a residential neighborhood. We get murdered for holding cell phones while standing in our grandmother’s backyard. The racism that strung up our ancestors, kept them sequestered to the back of the bus and kept them in separate and unequal schools still lives. It lives, and it’s more palpable than dormant. To me, this means one thing: Trump’s America isn’t an unfortunate circumstance, it’s a homecoming event that’s hundreds of years in the making, no matter how many times my white friends’ say, “He’s not my president.” In light of this homecoming, we now flirt with a new, larger fear of a Black genocide. America has always worked towards Black eradication through a steady stream of life-threatening inequality, but nuclear war on American soil would be swift. And for this reason I’ve grown tired of whiteness being at the center of the nuclear conversation. The race-neutral approach to the dialogue, and a tendency to continue to promote the idea that missiles will land in suburban and rural backyards, instead of inner-city playgrounds, is false. “The Day After,” the iconic, highest-rated television film in history, aired November 20, 1983. More than 100 million people tuned in to watch a film postulating a war between the Soviet Union and the United States. The film, which would go on to affect President Ronald Reagan and policymakers’ nuclear intentions, shows the “true effects of nuclear war on average American citizens.” The Soviet-targeted areas featured in the film include Higginsville, Kansas City, Sedalia, Missouri, as well as El Dorado Springs, Missouri. They depict the destruction of the central United States, and viewers watch as full-scale nuclear war transforms middle America into a burned wasteland. Yet unsurprisingly, the devastation from the attack is completely white-washed, leaving out the more likely victims which are the more densely populated (Black) areas. Death tolls would be high for white populations, yes, but large-scale losses of Black and brown folks would outpace that number, due to placement and poverty. That number would be pushed higher by limited access to premium health care, wealth, and resources. The effects of radiation sickness, burns, compounded injuries, and malnutrition would throttle Black and brown communities and would mark us for generations. It’s for that reason that we have to do more to foster disaster preparedness among Black people where we can. Black people deserve the space to explore nuclear unease, even if we have competing threats, anxieties, and worries. Jacqui Patterson, Director of the Environmental and Climate Justice Initiative, once stated: African American communities are disproportionately vulnerable to and impacted by natural (and unnatural) catastrophes. Our socio-economic vulnerability is based on multiple factors including our lack of wealth to cushion us, our disproportionate representation in lower quality housing stock, and our relative lack of mobility, etc.

## Case

#### Their RoJ is arbitrary and self serving and is used to magnify their own offense. Voting aff doesn’t do anything. Ballot wont alter subjecitivities

Bagley doesn’t take out innovation, our ev ow on recensy and the card says knowledge is good for innovation so we should protect it

Resource extraction cant solve patents

#### 1] Reverse causality- there’s no causal reason why corporations patenting something like turmeric reduces the ability of Indians to use turmeric as well. At most, its that they lack credit, but that form of politics is exactly what our thesis criticizes

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)