## 1 – Theory

#### Interpretation: The affirmative debater may not defend that nations ought to reduce protections for a subset of medicines or a single medicine.

#### “Medicines” is a generic bare plural.

Nebel 19 Nebel, Jake, assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs Institute, “Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution,” 12 August 2019, Vbriefly, accessed 31 August 2021, <https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/?fbclid=IwAR0hUkKdDzHWrNeqEVI7m59pwsnmqLl490n4uRLQTe7bWmWDO_avWCNzi14>

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions. Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window. So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why. “Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons. First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural. Second, “colleges and universities” fails the [upward-entailment test](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#IsolGeneInte) for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals. Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universities generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution.

#### It applies to “medicines” – a) upward entailment test – the res doesn’t entail that nations ought to reduce IP protections for inventions because it might not apply to things like art or digital tech, and b) adverb test – saying they usually ought to reduce IP protections doesn’t substantially change the meaning of the res. Outweighs their evidence – it tells us what to do with indefinite singulars, whereas they assume bare plurals can only mean one thing.

#### Violation: they only defend reducing protections for COVID-19 prevention, treatment, and containment.

#### Standards:

#### [1] Precision – The counter-interp justifies arbitrarily doing away with words in the res, which decks neg ground and prep because the aff is no longer bounded to a topical advocacy. The judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### [2] Limits and ground – They can spec any medicines including COVID treatments, antibiotics, antidepressants, vaccines, etc. and any permutation of them which explodes my prep burden – I have to prep against thousands of affs individually which skews engagement as they have infinite prep time to frontline your one aff whereas I won’t be prepared for yours – wrecks neg prep since there’s marginal differences in the advantage but it takes out ground like DAs to medicines. Uniquely harms small school debaters who are incapable of cutting large backfiles which harms inclusion – that’s a voter since we have to make the debate space safe, and it’s a pre-requisite to debate.

#### TVA: read your aff as an advantage under a whole advantage – solves all your offense.

#### Voters:

#### Fairness – a) debate is a competitive activity that objective evaluation to function, and b) debaters quit if it’s unfair, which makes it an internal link to all other impacts.

#### DTD – a) deters future abuse so they won’t reviolate, and b) T indicts the entire aff.

#### Prefer competing interps – a) you can’t be “reasonably topical,” b) reasonability is arbitrary, and c) collapses because brightlines concede offense-defense paradigm.

#### No RVIs – a) you don’t win for being fair, b) people will bait theory to win on the RVI, which causes abuse, c) people will be scared to call out real abuse for fear of being out-teched on the RVI, and d) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong, which forces me to argue for bad norms.

## 2 – Theory

#### Interpretation: debaters must include the URL in citations for their evidence.

#### Violation: they didn’t – examples include their Bostrom card(s).

#### Standards:

#### [1] NSDA rules – the unified manual says to include the URL.

NSDA 21 National Speech and Debate Association, “High School Unified Manual,” 1 September 2021, National Speech and Debate Association, accessed 11 September 2021, pg. 30, <https://www.speechanddebate.org/wp-content/uploads/High-School-Unified-Manual-2021-2022.pdf> ~ST~

Written source citation. To the extent provided by the original source, a written source citation must include:

1. Full name of primary author and/or editor

2. Publication date

3. Source

4. Title of article

5. Date accessed for digital evidence

6. Full URL, if applicable

7. Author qualifications

8. Page number(s)

#### That’s a voter – if we can choose what rules to break, I can make speeches however long I want, which is a side constraint to substance. Also proves the shell is reasonable and predictable because it’s by far the most common standard.

#### [2] Evidence ethics – no way to check whether their quote exists because we can’t find it on the internet – they can just make up whatever “evidence” they want, and there’s not enough time for us to verify that it is actually legit evidence. Pasting into a search engine doesn’t solve – a) many texts have weird formatting that prevents it from functioning, and b) difficult to find the correct version or one without a paywall. That’s a voter – a) debate is meaningless if we’re academically dishonest and have no argument credibility, b) uncredible evidence means we don’t know if their claims are true, which also serves as a substantive indict, and c) debate should prepare for the real world, in which small ev ethics violations are punished severely – large repercussions the control internal link to other impacts.

#### Also links to inclusion – small school debaters tend to use cards from the wiki. Bad citations negatively impact their research. That’s a voter because inclusion is a prereq to debate.

#### DTD – a) in real life, you don’t get a quote cut out of your essay; you get a 0 on it – it’s best to teach good norms now, and b) deters future abuse.

#### C/A CI and no RVIs

## 3 – Determinism

#### The ROTB is truth testing.

#### [1] Five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true – it’s intrinsic to the activity.

#### [2] Every statement is a question of truth – saying the res is false is the same as saying, “it is true that the res is false.” That means other ROTBs collapse to truth testing.

#### They didn’t warrant ROTB

#### Determinism negates – we don’t have free will, which disproves moral obligation.

#### If util is true, it entails that X cause will lead to Y effect. That means X cause is an effect of a cause prior to X itself, which means causal chains of events structure action.

#### First, everything is determined.

#### [1] Everything is determined. Effects and causal chains are the necessary result of past causes.

Timpe no date, Kevin Timpe, professor of philosophy at Northwest Nazarene University, "Free Will," no date, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed 21 August 2021, <https://iep.utm.edu/freewill/> ~ST~

Most contemporary scholarship on free will focuses on whether or not it is compatible with causal determinism. Causal determinism is sometimes also called “nomological determinism.” It is important to keep causal determinism distinct from other sorts of determinism, such as logical determinism or theological determinism (to be discussed below). Causal determinism (hereafter, simply “determinism”) is the thesis that the course of the future is entirely determined by the conjunction of the past and the laws of nature. Imagine a proposition that completely describes the way that the entire universe was at some point in the past, say 100 million years ago. Let us call this proposition “P.” Also imagine a proposition that expresses the conjunction of all the laws of nature; call this proposition “L.” Determinism then is the thesis that the conjunction of P and L entails a unique future. Given P and L, there is only one possible future, one possible way for things to end up. To make the same point using possible world semantics, determinism is the thesis that all the states of affairs that obtain at some time in the past, when conjoined with the laws of nature, entail which possible world is the actual world. Since a possible world includes those states of affairs that will obtain, the truth of determinism amounts to the thesis that the past and the laws of nature entail what states of affairs will obtain in the future, and that only those states of affairs entailed by the past and the laws will in fact obtain.

#### [2] Brain signals determine action before the conception of choice even arises.

Fried et. al 11 Itzhak Fried, professor of neurosurgery, psychiatry and biobehavioral sciences at UCLA, Roy Mukamel, associate professor of psychology at Tel-Aviv University, Gabriel Kreiman, professor of ophthalmology at Harvard, "Internally generated preactivation of single neurons in human medial frontal cortex predicts volition," 10 February 2011, PubMed, accessed 21 August 2021, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21315264/> ~ST~

There has been a long debate on the existence of brain signals that precede the outcome of decisions, even before subjects believe they are consciously making up their mind. The framework of multivariate decoding provides a novel tool for investigating such choice-predictive information contained in neural signals leading up to a decision. New results show that the specific outcome of free choices between different plans can be interpreted from brain activity, not only after a decision has been made, but even several seconds before it is made. This suggests that a causal chain of events can occur outside subjective awareness even before a subject makes up his/her mind. An important future line of research would be to develop paradigms that allow feedback of real-time predictions of future decisions to reveal whether such decisions can still be reverted. This would shed light on how tight the causal link is between early predictive brain signals and subsequent decisions.

#### Next, that disproves moral obligations since they’re predicated on the possibility of alternate actions – a) events in your life aren’t actions without a potential alternate; they just happen to you, b) you can’t have an obligation over something you have no control over, and c) morality only exists in opposition to immorality. If there is only one action, then it can’t be moral.

#### Also, permissibility negates:

#### [1] The res says they have to prove obligation. Permissibility is sufficient to negate because you can’t be obligated and lack an obligation simultaneously.

#### [2] Statements are more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways but true in only one.

#### We’ll answer it affirms – no impact to drinking water, other warrant is for presumption.
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