### T

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must garner offense only from topical links between their advocacy and the resolution (may not advocate extra-topical action in addition to the resolution)

#### Violation: The affirmative claims impacts from actions not specific from waivers rather they go further and mandate people make the medicine after the waiver is lifted – (they don’t meet – they don’t read how this is on patents)

#### Standards

#### Solvency ground: Extra-topical positions co-opt my ground by excluding arguments like solvency deficits. Because they advocate something external to resolution, they can advocate something that solves all of the disadvantages or shortcomings of the resolutional action. This reduces the burden on the affirmative to solve the problems of the AC because they can be solved by an infinite number of non-topical planks of their advocacy. Excluding this key ground for me to garner offense is unfair and asymmetrical; it collapses my ability to garner offense to the resolutional action, whereas the aff garners offense from the resolution AND/OR anything else, making the structure of the debate inherently unfair.

#### Research Burdens: Allowing for extra-topical advocacies permits an infinite number of affirmative positions insofar as they can advocate any impact scenario, regardless of whether it relates to any interpretation of the resolution. Because these are impossible to predict, the research burden for the negative explodes and I am prevented from prepping answers to the advocacy of my opponent because it could literally be anything. Additionally, this prevents the establishment of reciprocal burdens insofar as only the negative has this structural disadvantage. This is inherently unfair because it is infinitely harder for the neg to win.

#### Underlimiting ground: Extratopicality is bad because it underlimits ground. Allowing extratopicality allows for infinitely many potential advocacies. The aff/neg can advocate resolution action in addition to literally anything else. This gives them the best link and impact stories because they can pick and choose from any impact of any size. This makes it impossible for the me to compete and puts the neg at an unfair disadvantage when structuring positions.

#### Predictability for prep: Extratopicality is incredibly unpredictable. Allowing extratopical advocacies prevents me from prepping answers to the impact scenario of my opponent because their impact scenario could be literally anything. Infinite research burdens are impossible and unfair because they’re only placed on the neg.

#### Counterplan ground: Extratopicality destroys negative counterplan ground because the aff gets to claim actions outside of the resolution. The neg loses access to plan exclusive counterplans because everything outside the resolution that is typically neg ground is now potential aff ground. Counterplan ground is key to negative strategy because it’s how I garner offense outside of turns/disads to the resolutional action.

#### Fiat abuse: Extratopicality relies on egregrious fiat abuse. Extratopical advocacies give aff way too much quality ground by allowing resolutional action in addition to any highly unlikely but hugely beneficial. Fiat abuse here is unfair because it explodes great aff ground. It’s also uneducational because it’s so unlikely and has no real world application.

#### 7.- Irresolvable – they don’t prove the res true meaning you cant affirm because they haven’t fulfilled their obligation of proving the res in this debate

#### Voters

#### Fairness is a voter:

1. Debate is a competitive activity- means any decision you render in an unfair round is arbitrary because unfairness skews the evaluation of a round
2. People see different things as educational but everyone can see blatant structural abuse

#### Education is a voter:

1. Debate is an educational activity- key to schools funding debate
2. Education is the only long term impact to debate

#### Drop the debater:

1. The abuse has already been committed- dropping the argument gives no incentive to not be abusive- drop the debater to promote good in round norms
2. Time skew- I spent a large portion of my speech time explaining why their position was abusive- dropping the debater is the only way to rectify time skew
3. Substance has already been tainted by the abusive practice- no way to accurately evaluate it now

#### Competing interps:

1. Reasonability is arbitrary- I don’t know what you think is reasonable so competing interps is the only way to render a decision on theory
2. Resolvability- clear and concise rules make theory easier to adjudicate

#### No RVIs:

1. If you win a counterinterp it just means your practice isn’t abusive- doesn’t justify voting for you
2. Chilling effect- if we give debaters RVIs other debaters will be too afraid to check abuse because good theory debaters will beat them on it- no way to check abuse

**DA: Business Confidence**

1. **Sustained economic growth and recovery driven by business investment and Biden-led certainty that builds business-confidence**

**Chaney-Cambon 6/27/21**

(Sarah, “Capital-Spending Surge Further Lifts Economic Recovery,” pg online @ <https://www.wsj.com/articles/capital-spending-surge-further-lifts-economic-recovery-11624798800> //um-ef)

Business investment is emerging as a powerful source of U.S. economic growth that will likely help sustain the recovery. Companies are ramping up orders for computers, machinery and software as they grow more confident in the outlook. Nonresidential fixed investment, a proxy for business spending, rose at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 11.7% in the first quarter, led by growth in software and tech-equipment spending, according to the Commerce Department. Business investment also logged double-digit gains in the third and fourth quarters last year after falling during pandemic-related shutdowns. It is now higher than its pre-pandemic peak. Orders for nondefense capital goods excluding aircraft, another measure for business investment, are near the highest levels for records tracing back to the 1990s, separate Commerce Department figures show. “Business investment has really been an important engine powering the U.S. economic recovery,” said Robert Rosener, senior U.S. economist at Morgan Stanley. “In our outlook for the economy, it’s certainly one of the bright spots.” Consumer spending, which accounts for about two-thirds of economic output, is driving the early stages of the recovery. Americans, flush with savings and government stimulus checks, are spending more on goods and services, which they shunned for much of the pandemic. **Robust capital investment will be key to ensuring that the recovery maintains strength after the** spending boost from fiscal stimulus and business reopenings eventually fades, according to some economists. Rising business investment helps fuel economic output. It also lifts worker productivity, or output per hour. That metric grew at a sluggish pace throughout the last economic expansion but is now showing signs of resurgence. The recovery in business investment is shaping up to be much stronger than in the years following the 2007-09 recession. “The events especially in late ’08, early ’09 put a lot of businesses really close to the edge,” said Phil Suttle, founder of Suttle Economics. “I think a lot of them said, ‘We’ve just got to be really cautious for a long while.’” Businesses appear to be less risk-averse now, he said. After the financial crisis, businesses grew by adding workers, rather than investing in capital. Hiring was more attractive than capital spending because labor was abundant and relatively cheap. Now the supply of workers is tight. Companies are raising pay to lure employees. As a result, many firms have more incentive to grow by investing in capital. Economists at Morgan Stanley predict that U.S. capital spending will rise to 116% of prerecession levels after three years. By comparison, investment took 10 years to reach those levels once the 2007-09 recession hit. Company executives **are increasingly confident** in the economy’s trajectory. The Business Roundtable’s economic-outlook index—a composite of large companies’ plans for hiring and spending, as well as sales projections—increased by nine points in the second quarter to 116, just below 2018’s record high, according to a survey conducted between May 25 and June 9. In the second quarter, the share of companies planning to boost capital investment increased to 59% from 57% in the first. “We’re seeing really strong reopening demand, and a lot of times capital investment follows that,” said Joe Song, senior U.S. economist at BofA Securities. Mr. Song added that less uncertainty regarding trade tensions between the U.S. and China should further underpin **business confidence** and investment. “At the very least, businesses will understand the strategy that the Biden administration is trying to follow and will be able to plan around that,” he said. Some of the recent increases in capital spending reflect a silver lining to the shortages of raw materials that many manufacturers have faced in recent months. “The flip side of the supply-chain bottlenecks that we’re seeing right now is that order backlogs are building,” said Mr. Rosener, which he said in turn has led to higher manufacturing activity. Demand for manufactured goods strengthened in May, while customer inventories hit an all-time low, according to the Institute for Supply Management’s manufacturing survey. Manufacturing is a particularly capital-intensive industry. It requires more spending to build a car than to serve a restaurant meal, Mr. Rosener said. Production could remain strong for several quarters as companies rebuild inventories, he said. The longer-term outlook for capital spending is bright. Though economic uncertainty tends to damp capital spending, an economic disruption such as Covid-19 can support investment. The pandemic forced companies to minimize contact between consumers and workers, resulting in a rapid increase in spending on productivity-enhancing digital technology that many economists predict will endure. “Every part of the service economy is using technology more aggressively,” said Mr. Suttle. “Obviously it’s hard to do that without buying more product.”

1. **Waivers crush business confidence**

#### Empirically intellectual property protection is directly related to the high levels of business confidence

[Xinhua](http://www.xinhuanet.com/english2010/), Singapore best in Asia for intellectual property protection 19:14, September 06, 2013 http://en.people.cn/90777/8392530.html

Singapore is the best in Asia for intellectual property protection and the second best in the world, the Intellectual Property Office of Singapore said Friday, citing a report by the World Economic Forum. The latest Global Competitiveness Report, with intellectual property protection as one of the criteria, covered nearly 150 countries and regions. It is the third year in a row for Singapore to retain the top ranking in Asia. Singapore's Intellectual Property Office said its business- friendly intellectual property regime has bolstered business confidence of international conglomerates and attracted long-term investment in research and development by multinationals. Singapore came in the second place in the overall global competitiveness ranking, trailing Switzerland. China's Hong Kong was the seventh, while Japan came in the 9th.

#### Business confidence drives economic recovery.

Mortgage Medics, 6-15-2021, [mortgage consulting firm, "How business and consumer confidence will drive the recovery", https://www.mortgage-medics.com/how-business-and-consumer-confidence-will-drive-the-recovery/ //Weese]

Confidence: we’re not talking here about standing up to make a speech, rather about business confidence and consumer confidence. Over the last 12 months we’ve heard the terms a lot, as confidence plunged when the first lockdown was announced and then rose again as the vaccine roll-out began. But what is confidence? And why does it matter? If we look at business confidence first, a good example, and one that is often quoted on the financial pages, is the Purchasing Managers’ Index (PMI). So what is it? And how does it work? The PMI is a measure of business confidence, showing whether business expects the economy and prevailing business conditions to be favourable or unfavourable. The PMI is based on a monthly survey sent to senior executives across a broad spread of industries and asks questions about new orders, inventory levels, production, deliveries and employment. The ‘headline’ number, the one you will often see quoted, can be anywhere between 0 and 100. In ‘normal times’ it hovers around 50, with any figure above indicating that business is confident about the future, whilst a figure below 50 suggests the opposite. To give you an example of the PMI in action, last April the PMI in the Eurozone crashed to 13.5 as the economic impact of the pandemic became apparent. The UK fared even worse, with the PMI falling to a record low of 12.3 in the services sector. Twelve months later, with the vaccine rollout gathering pace, the PMI for the UK had risen to 61.0. As noted in the above example, you may also see PMI figures quoted for different sectors of the economy, such as manufacturing and services. Consumer confidence has a similar numerical value, although that is expressed in plus or minus terms. In April the Consumer Confidence Index rose to minus 15, up from minus 16 in March. Although negative, that was the highest figure since March of last year, with the Index having been as low as minus 34 in May 2020. Why is confidence important? When consumers feel confident they are more likely to spend and more likely to borrow, both of which are likely to boost the economy. A very simple example is home improvements: we are unlikely to spend the money on a new bathroom, which would benefitting the bathroom supplier and the plumber, unless we feel confident about our future prospects and employment. The search for confidence, or at least, stability, is almost certainly the reason so many people have left the hospitality sector during the last year (with many outlets now struggling to find staff to re-open). Similarly, when businesses feel confident they will invest in both equipment and new members of staff. Clearly any potential “third wave” of the virus would dent confidence again: that is one of the reasons why the Government is so keen to avoid any further lockdowns. It needs to rebuild not just the economy, but our confidence in the economy. Perhaps then we will start to spend the billions of pounds that we, as consumers, have saved over the past year.

1. **Impact Story**

#### Modern economic decline bread a new an increasingly tense world – each decline exponentially increases risk of world war

Sundaram 19 [Jomo Kwame Sundaram, a former economics professor, was United Nations Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development, and received the Wassily Leontief Prize for Advancing the Frontiers of Economic Thought in 2007. Vladimir Popov, a former senior economics researcher in the Soviet Union, Russia and the United Nations Secretariat, is now Research Director at the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute in Berlin. Economic Crisis Can Trigger World War. February 12, 2019. www.ipsnews.net/2019/02/economic-crisis-can-trigger-world-war/]

KUALA LUMPUR and BERLIN, Feb 12 2019 (IPS) - Economic recovery efforts since the 2008-2009 global financial crisis have mainly depended on unconventional monetary policies. As fears rise of yet another international financial crisis, there are growing concerns about the increased possibility of large-scale military conflict. More worryingly, in the current political landscape, prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising economic inequality, chauvinistic ethno-populism as well as aggressive jingoist rhetoric, including threats, could easily spin out of control and ‘morph’ into military conflict, and worse, world war. Crisis responses limited The 2008-2009 global financial crisis almost ‘bankrupted’ governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the world economy from the brink, but soon switched from counter-cyclical fiscal efforts to unconventional monetary measures, primarily ‘quantitative easing’ and very low, if not negative real interest rates. But while these monetary interventions averted realization of the worst fears at the time by turning the US economy around, they did little to address underlying economic weaknesses, largely due to the ascendance of finance in recent decades at the expense of the real economy. Since then, despite promising to do so, policymakers have not seriously pursued, let alone achieved, such needed reforms. Instead, ostensible structural reformers have taken advantage of the crisis to pursue largely irrelevant efforts to further ‘casualize’ labour markets. This lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented liquidity central banks injected into economies has not been well allocated to stimulate resurgence of the real economy. From bust to bubble Instead, easy credit raised asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. US house prices are now 8% more than at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, while its price-to-earnings ratio in late 2018 was even higher than in 2008 and in 1929, when the Wall Street Crash precipitated the Great Depression. As monetary tightening checks asset price bubbles, another economic crisis — possibly more severe than the last, as the economy has become less responsive to such blunt monetary interventions — is considered likely. A decade of such unconventional monetary policies, with very low interest rates, has greatly depleted their ability to revive the economy. The implications beyond the economy of such developments and policy responses are already being seen. Prolonged economic distress has worsened public antipathy towards the culturally alien — not only abroad, but also within. Thus, another round of economic stress is deemed likely to foment unrest, conflict, even war as it is blamed on the foreign. International trade shrank by two-thirds within half a decade after the US passed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930, at the start of the Great Depression, ostensibly to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition! Liberalization’s discontents Rising economic insecurity, inequalities and deprivation are expected to strengthen ethno-populist and jingoistic nationalist sentiments, and increase social tensions and turmoil, especially among the growing precariat and others who feel vulnerable or threatened. Thus, ethno-populist inspired chauvinistic nationalism may exacerbate tensions, leading to conflicts and tensions among countries, as in the 1930s. Opportunistic leaders have been blaming such misfortunes on outsiders and may seek to reverse policies associated with the perceived causes, such as ‘globalist’ economic liberalization. Policies which successfully check such problems may reduce social tensions, as well as the likelihood of social turmoil and conflict, including among countries. However, these may also inadvertently exacerbate problems. The recent spread of anti-globalization sentiment appears correlated to slow, if not negative per capita income growth and increased economic inequality. To be sure, globalization and liberalization are statistically associated with growing economic inequality and rising ethno-populism. Declining real incomes and growing economic insecurity have apparently strengthened ethno-populism and nationalistic chauvinism, threatening economic liberalization itself, both within and among countries. Insecurity, populism, conflict Thomas Piketty has argued that a sudden increase in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Although causality is difficult to prove, with wealth and income inequality now at historical highs, this should give cause for concern. Of course, other factors also contribute to or exacerbate civil and international tensions, with some due to policies intended for other purposes. Nevertheless, even if unintended, such developments could inadvertently catalyse future crises and conflicts. Publics often have good reason to be restless, if not angry, but the emotional appeals of ethno-populism and jingoistic nationalism are leading to chauvinistic policy measures which only make things worse. At the international level, despite the world’s unprecedented and still growing interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed as the US increasingly resorts to unilateral, sovereigntist policies without bothering to even build coalitions with its usual allies. Avoiding Thucydides’ iceberg Thus, protracted economic distress, economic conflicts or another financial crisis could lead to military confrontation by the protagonists, even if unintended. Less than a decade after the Great Depression started, the Second World War had begun as the Axis powers challenged the earlier entrenched colonial powers.