### 1NC – T-States

#### Interp: The affirmative may not specify a subset of medicines on which the member nations of the World Trade organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections

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

Leslie 12 Leslie, Sarah-Jane. “Generics.” In Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Language, edited by Gillian Russell and Delia Fara, 355–366. Routledge, 2012. <https://www.princeton.edu/~sjleslie/RoutledgeHandbookEntryGenerics.pdf> SM

GENERICS VS. EXISTENTIALS The interpretation of sentences containing bare plurals, indefinite singulars, or definite singulars can be either generic as in (1) respectively or existential/specific as in (2): (1) Tigers are striped A tiger is striped The tiger is striped. (2) Tigers are on the front lawn A tiger is on the front lawn The tiger is on the front lawn. The subjects in (1) are prima facie the same as in (2), yet their interpretations in (1) are intuitively quite different from those in (2). In (2) we are talking about some particular tigers, while in (1) we are saying something about tigers in general. 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. For example, if it is true that tigers are on the lawn, then it will also be true that animals are on the lawn. This is not so if the sentence is interpreted generically. For example, it is true that tigers are striped, but it does not follow that animals are striped (Lawler 1973 Laca 1990; Krifka et al 1995). Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification (in the sense of Lewis 1975) with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in (1) (e.g. “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in (2) 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”.)

#### This applies to the res – 1] Upward entailment test – Saying some medicines ought to be banned doesn’t entail that they all ought to be 2] Adverb test – medicines generally ought to be banned isn’t different from the res

#### Semantics is a voter - if we win their grammatical interpretation is incorrect then we win the round: they don’t get to win defending something else.

#### a] Predictability – people base prep off the rez – no stasis point for arguments.

#### b] Jurisdiction – judges are obligated to vote on the topic, so even if you prove that the aff is true the judge can’t vote on it if you don’t prove the res true. Jurisdiction o/w b/c otherwise judges vote on anything they want and debate doesn’t matter.

#### c] Neg prep – semantics controls internal link to pragmatics b/c the words in the resolution should determine the division of aff and neg ground, anything else is arbitrary and wrecks pre-round prep because we only know what to prepare based on the words of the resolution

#### Violation: They specify \_\_\_\_\_

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Limits – any permutation of any medicines each with different applications and consequences explodes aff ground – you cherry-pick affs with no neg ground. I must prep all affs while they prep one – forces uplayering and shallow debates. Pigeonholes me to generics that you’ll prep out with aff leverage so I lose on specificity.

#### b] Topic education – picking obscure medicines skirts the topic literature and prevents substantive engagement with actual controversies, encourages one-weekend affs that have no opposing literature. Our model is k2 learning about the core of the topic through debates about generics

#### 2] TVA – read this aff as an advantage – we still get discussion on it – non-uniques any reason why their aff is uniquely good.

#### Voters:

#### Fairness – [a] Fairness – debate is fundamentally a game which requires both sides to have a relatively equal shot at winning and is necessary for any benefit to the activity. That outweighs: [1] Decision-making: every argument concedes to the validity of fairness i.e. that the judge will make a fair decision based on the arguments presented. This means if they win fairness bad vote neg on presumption because you have no obligation to fairly evaluate their arguments. [2] Probability: voting aff can’t solve any of their impacts but it can solve ours. All the ballot does is tell tab who won which can’t stop any violence but can resolve the fairness imbalance in this particular debate. [3] Fairness is a prior question to effective dialogue – If fairness is bad writ large vote neg regardless of the flow because it’s unfair. [4] The alternative to fairness is the same conditions of debate you say are bad which means if the aff is important, it necessarily means fairness is. [5] If the judge doesn't enforce fairness, none of your scholarship would pass since it would give them the unfair jurisdiction to reject it and vote you down. Even if they don't, rejecting fairness is a practice that would justify a bad norm, which all your arguments are predicated on anyways. [6] We can’t compare or interact to find the best solution to violence if the unfair nature of your arguments prevents me from strategizing. Fairness is an integral part of your solvency. 7] Fairness is constitutive process of debate since debate is a game with a winner and loser, speech times, and flipping 30 min before the round- Constitutive Rules means any DA to our interpretation are inevitable and terminally non-unique

#### Education – it’s the only portable skill we take out of round.

#### Drop the debater – 1] a loss deters future abuse 2] dropping the arg severs from your original advocacy which creates a 7-6 timeskew when you read new offense.

#### Competing interps – 1] Your brightline is arbitrary and based on what you did rather than the best one. 2] leads to a race to the top since we figure out the best possible norm

#### No RVI on T – 1] logic – you shouldn’t win for being topical – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for arguments. 2] they encourage you to read an abusive aff and prep out T. 3] enables us to return to substance and get that education rather than debating T the whole time.

### K

#### Their role of the ballot forces the judge into the role of coercer and defeats the purpose of critical pedagogy – outweighs their impact because this is cyclical violence.

#### Rickert, (Thomas, “"Hands Up, You're Free": Composition in a Post-Oedipal World”, JacOnline Journal,) An example of the connection between violence and pedagogy is implicit in the notion of being "schooled" as it has been conceptualized by Giroux [is] and Peter Mcl.aren.

#### They explain, "Fundamental to the principles that inform critical pedagogy is the conviction that schooling for self- and social empowerment is ethically prior to questions of epistemology or to a mastery oftechnical or social skills that are primarily tied to the logic of the marketplace" (153-54). A presumption here is that it is the teacher who knows (best), and this orientation gives the concept of schooling a particular bite: though it presents itself as oppositional to the state and the dominant forms of pedagogy that serve the state and its capitalist interests, it nevertheless reinscribes an authoritarian model that is congruent with any number of oedipalizing pedagogies that "school" the student in proper behavior. As Diane Davis notes, radical, feminist, and liberatory pedagogies "often camouflage pedagogical violence in their move from one mode of 'normalization' to another" and "function within a disciplinary matrix of power, a covert carceral system, that aims to create useful subjects for particular political agendas" (212). Such oedipalizing pedagogies are less effective in practice than what the claims for them assert; indeed, the attempt to "school" students in the manner called for by Giroux and McLaren is complicitous with the malaise of postmodern cynicism. Students will dutifully go through their liberatory motions, producing the proper assignments, but it remains an open question whether they carry an oppositional politics with them. The "critical distance" supposedly created with liberatory pedagogy also opens up a cynical distance toward the writing produced in class.

#### Their pedagogy epistemically privileges certain types of knowledge and belief over others through the construction of ‘meta-narratives’ that fabricate society. This model of education incites ideological dogmatism, fascism, and students unprepared for productive dialogue that can translate into real-world activism. Gur Ze’ev 07, “Toward a non-repressive critical pedagogy.” Ilan Gur Ze’ev.<https://sci-hub.st/10.1111/j.1741-5446.1998.00463.x> Freire’s Critical Pedagogy is foundationalist and positivist, in contrast to his explicit negation of this orientation. It is a synthesis between dogmatic idealism and vulgar collectivism meant to sound the authentic voice of the collective, within which the dialogue is supposed to become aware of itself and of the world. The educational links of this synthesis contain a tension between its mystic-terroristic and its reflective-emancipatory dimensions. In Freire’s attitude towards Fidel Castro and Che Guevara, the terroristic potential contained in the mystic conception of the emancipated “group”, “people”, or “class” knowledge is revealed within the concept of a dialogue. Freire introduces Che Guevara [is] as an ideal model for anti-violent dialogue between partners in the desirable praxis. Che Guevara used a structurally similar rhetoric to that of Ernst Juenger and National Socialist ideologues on the creative power of war, blood, and sweat in the constitution of a new man, the real “proletar” in South America. Freire gives this [is]as an example of the liberation of the oppressed within the framework of new “love” relations which allow to speak the silenced “voice”.(15) His uncritical understanding of power/knowledge relations draws him to observe the de-colonization process in Africa and elsewhere (undoubtedly a progressive development in itself) as suitable contexts for national realization of Critical Pedagogy.(16) This is not mere naivity but a readjustment of the terroristic element of his Critical Pedagogy revealed earlier in his understanding of “Che” as an educator in his alliance with the national systematic oppression of “liberated” Third World countries. I do not claim that there is no need to support local struggles for democracy, equality, and development in such countries or that it is impossible for them to be regarded as inferior or undemocratic in principle. My claim does not refer even to a specific country, since it is possible that in some cases a Third World country will develop a flourishing democracy. However, for historical reasons, such as Western imperialism, local power structures, cultural traditions, and conceptual apparatuses, Western-style democracy is not likely to be realized in most of them. My argument refers to Freire’s failure in the crucial theoretical and political element of the concept of dialogue and the relation between knowledge and power, consciousness and violence, as presented by Hegel, Marx, Adorno, and Foucault. That is why his emancipatory Eros sides implicitly with the anti-critical tradition of dogmatic revolutionary Christianity and voluntaristic revolutionary models of the anarchists, National Socialism, and South America’s guerrillas. These are contrasted with the explicit devotion of his Critical Pedagogy to dialogue, [and] non-functionalist Critical Thinking, as well as spiritual maturity. Like the Frankfurt School’s Critical Theory, Freire’s [this] project is also indebted to the negation of present reality. However, from the totality of reality and its power games it attempts to expropriate knowledge of repressive groups as possessing special validity; from the totality governed by power to save a certain “authentic will” and consciousness which are devoted to an erotic praxis. Within Critical Pedagogy they are supposed to be freed from the dynamics and internal logic of reality implicitly, in the name of the superiority of the essence of being. In contrast to the Critical Theory’s concept of love, (17) this kind of love is immanently violent, even in the sense of political terror and the control of collective and individual consciousness. Its interest in dialogue is not erotic and transcendent but is what Plato called “popular Eros” (Plato 1927, 344), as manifested by Alcibiades, the great disciple and lover of Socrates. It is not surprising that Alcibiades became a traitor to his fatherland and even to those with whom he sided. Alcibiades’ political acts of betrayal are but a manifestation of his treachery against “the heavenly Eros,”(18) flaunting the earthly superiority of “the popular Eros”(19) and rejecting the struggle for spiritual maturity and transcendence. Freire acts as if he were Alcibiades, finding himself a Socrates who agrees to teach him “the truth”. As in the case of Alcibiades, this “popular Eros” functions as an *impetus* to a political power game, seeking its expansion through philosophical education and entrance into a dialogue that promises warm and easy love, after being disappointed in transforming “heavenly Eros” into a positive political power/knowledge alternative.**My argument about [this] Freire’s project is that non-critical and automatic preference for the self-evident knowledge of the oppressed to that of the oppressors is dangerous. The self-evidence of “the people” or a social or cultural group**, even when developed to reflectivity by a grand leader-educator, **is not without a terroristic potential.** On the one hand, the idea is that the educational leader is responsible for the success of the project, while by the same token he (not she) has to be a total lover and be totally loved. This is within the framework of a praxis whose starting point is the self-evidence of the group and earthly politics. This opens the gate to totalitarianism as earthly heaven. These poles, with violence as their secret connection, are manifested in other poles in the system, as personified in the identification of Freire with Che Guevara or Fidel Castro and his own acceptance by his followers as a guru who encourages the groups and creates the horizon of their dialogues. It seems to me that the thinkers of both the first generation of the Frankfurt School, such as Adorno and Horkheimer, and of its second generation, such as Juergen Habermas and Karl Otto Apel, acknowledged the danger of this kind of education. They understood the difference between negation of social conditions alien to ideals of solidarity, understanding, and transcendence and the positive utopia of “love”. The latter was a false promise in effect produced a kind of “dialogue” reproducing the inner logic of existing power relations; it prevented transcendence and struggle for autonomy of the individual. Such an education blocks the possibility of counter-education, which is conditioned by an alternative critique. Counter-education as a starting point for a non-repressive critique does not rush into easy optimism, positive utopianism, and “love” of the kind that Freire promised. Within the framework of such a positive utopia, education constitutes itself either on the self-evidence of the group or on that of the leader-educator. That is why this kind of Critical Pedagogy is immanently endangered by overflowing into verbalism, dogmatism, or violence. Since Freire is careful to exclude the third option, his Critical Pedagogy is practically realized within the horizons of verbalism and dogmatism, which constantly threaten the project with unreflective acceptance of the false consciousness and knowledge of the repressed groups, who are unprepared for reflection on the dialogical process in which they are involved. Freire challenges this threat not within radical philosophical education but within political half-conservatism. (20) There are also important emancipatory elements in the anti-elitism of Freire’s and his followers’ Critical Pedagogy. The fall into the perils of violence is not inevitable in this project, even if it is immanent to the system. This version of Critical Pedagogy is of much value for groups and classes in the Third World and for marginalized and controlled groups in the Western world. To a certain degree, this pedagogy even incubates potential refusal of and resistance to the inner logic of capitalism and current technological progress, but because of its central problems it will never develop into anything more than a futile revolt standing on precarious foundations for counter-totalitarianism. The importance and the futility of this project are exemplified, for example, by one of Freire’s best-known American disciples, Ira Shor. Shor describes his experience in trying to criticize the self-evident knowledge of students at a communal college where one of America’s greatest myths - the hamburger - was questioned.(21) However, lacking Critical Theory’s “elitist” general theory, even the greatest achievement of this version of Critical Pedagogy is drawn into the order which it intended to rebel against. Lacking the need and the possibility of conceptualizing and articulating the critical “experience”, this critique is compelled to become another commodity needed in American colleges so as to be successful in the present order of things.

#### Thus, the alternative is to endorse a truth testing paradigm. The truth testing paradigm combats material problems by fostering real world education – it teaches debaters how to be successful advocates for real world solutions. **Branse 15,** 9-4-2015, "The Role of the Judge By David Branse (Part One)," NSD Update, http://nsdupdate.com/2015/09/04/the-role-of-the-judge-by-david-branse-part-one/ In debate, those rules are testing the truth of a pre-given and pre-prepared topic. Switch-side debate provides a unique forum where we A) don’t have to endorse our arguments as true since we contradict ourselves every round [and], B) view the process of warranting as supremely valuable, and C) can challenge all ethical assumptions we hold. Truth testing allows debaters to analyze arguments from a wide range of viewpoints, with an emphasis on contesting the warrants of every argument. In my opinion, the value and skills garnered in debate arise from the process of debating, not the content of the arguments or a particular pedagogical viewpoint. Debaters learn to structure logical syllogisms to warrant everything from the outrageous to the intuitive. The process of truth testing teaches debaters how to make decisions in the real world. We learn how to justify our beliefs and become good advocates not by rejecting this paradigm but by embracing it. Competition to determine the truth of a proposition motivates debaters to engage in the very practices that provide us education. Debaters extensively prep and research unique topical ideas for the sake of winning. Few debaters would have learned as much as they did about the living wage without debate’s competitive incentive.

**That’s key to prevent judge intervention which controls the IL to your role of the ballot since the judge can always hack against what you would consider good.** **Branse 2,** David Brasne '15 (), 9-4-2015, "The Role of the Judge By David Branse (Part One)," NSD Update,<http://nsdupdate.com/2015/09/04/the-role-of-the-judge-by-david-branse-part-one> First, bindingness: the practice rules argument I’ve sketched out illustrates this point. **Once a judge commits to a round in accordance with a set of rules**, the reasons within the round are different – **the rules are absolute** and non-optional. When a person signs a contract, **if they come to regard the terms of the contract as problematic, this is not a reason to disregard the contract. It might only be a reason to try to renegotiate it.** A decision about the practicality of the contract cannot, in itself, generate a reason to disobey the terms of the agreement. Second, arbitrariness: A maxim that provides the judge with the authority to vote on their perceived assessment of the activity’s goals seems to only emphasize the arbitrary, subjective elements of debate. There would be something deeply objectionable about the referee deciding to declare the better exerciser winner. **Impositions of practical judgments seem to just be unfair ex post facto rules that step outside the judge’s jurisdiction. This is especially true with debate** – education claims may seem somewhat intuitive, but there is no reason imposing practical judgments ends there. For example, one judge could come to believe that debate is a unique space to construct value judgments, and therefore the best debater is the one who best establishes a philosophy to win the round. Even though debate is a unique space for philosophical argumentation, no debater would feel comfortable for a judge voting on the AC framework when the neg won contention level offense beneath that framework. **Every judge will have different value judgments, and so the role of the judge in each round would oscillate. This emphasizes judge intervention**, and destroys the chance for debaters to predict each other’s arguments and thus engage with them. Very few people are comfortable viewing debate as an activity with oscillating rules where judges cannot be held to any predictable standard.

### Case

#### Vote neg on presumption –

#### Spillover

#### Systems

#### Medicine is defined by

**Lexico**

The science or practice of the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease (in technical use often taken to exclude surgery)

#### Queerness isn’t a disease

#### CP: Member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to eliminate intellectual property protections for gene-editing medicines except those not used to “treat” queerness

#### Gene-editing can solve sickle-cell anemia

**Isaacson 21**: Walter Isaacson, 2-19-2021, "What Gene Editing Can Do for Humankind", WSJ, https://www.wsj.com/articles/what-gene-editing-can-do-for-humankind-11613750317, accessed 9-18-2021, [**Walter Isaacson** (born May 20, 1952)[[2]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Walter_Isaacson#cite_note-mball-2) is an [American](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States) author, journalist, and professor. He has been the President and CEO of the [Aspen Institute](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aspen_Institute), a nonpartisan policy studies organization based in [Washington, D.C.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Washington,_D.C.), the chair and CEO of [CNN](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/CNN), and the editor of [*Time*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Time_magazine).] PHS-CB

That slippery slope should prompt us to consider both the wonderful benefits as well as the potential moral issues posed by the astonishing new technology. What might CRISPR do to the diversity of our species? If we are no longer subject to a natural lottery of endowments, will it weaken our feelings of empathy and acceptance? If the marvelous enhancements offered at the genetic supermarket aren’t free (and they won’t be), will that greatly increase inequality—and even encode it permanently in the human race?

Let’s start by considering the least controversial cases: fixing dreadful maladies caused by simple mutations, such as sickle-cell disease. Victoria Gray, a Mississippi woman, was effectively cured last year by removing some of her stem cells and editing them with CRISPR. That spurred no controversy because the gene editing was done in an adult’s cells and wouldn’t be inherited. But such treatments cost more than $1 million. A far more efficient approach would be to fix the mutation causing sickle-cell in early stage embryos, so that the resulting children and all their descendants would never have it. So why not make inheritable edits and eliminate the disease from our species?

#### Cancer–

**Fernandez 21** Clara RodrÍGuez FernÁNdez, 9-13-2021, "Eight Diseases That CRISPR Technology Could Cure", Labiotech.eu, https://www.labiotech.eu/best-biotech/crispr-technology-cure-disease/, accessed 9-18-2021, [https://www.labiotech.eu/best-biotech/crispr-technology-cure-disease/] PHS-CB

Here is a list of some of the first diseases that scientists are tackling using CRISPR-Cas technology, testing its possibilities and limits as a medical tool.

1. Cancer

China has been spearheading the first clinical trials using CRISPR-Cas9 as a cancer treatment. One of these studies was testing the [use of CRISPR to modify immune T cells](https://www.labiotech.eu/in-depth/crispr-cas9-review-gene-editing-tool/) extracted from the patient. The gene-editing technology is used to remove the gene that encodes for a protein called PD-1. This protein found on the surface of immune cells is the target of some cancer drugs such as [checkpoint inhibitors](https://www.labiotech.eu/tag/checkpoint-inhibitors/). This is because some tumor cells are able to bind to the PD-1 protein to block the immune response against cancer.

The trial tested this approach in 12 patients with non-small cell lung cancer at the West China Hospital. The results, published in April 2020, suggested the approach was feasible and safe.

However, [a later article](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41392-020-00283-8) pointed out that the study revealed some of the technology’s limitations, including variable efficiency in the genome-editing process. Some experts have recommended that the long-term safety of the approach remain under review. Others have suggested using more precise gene-editing approaches such as [base editing](https://www.labiotech.eu/interview/base-editing-horizon-discovery/).

In the US, a phase I trial run by the University of Pennsylvania tested the safety of a similar approach. The researchers used CRISPR to remove three genes that help cancer cells evade the immune system. They then added another gene to help the immune cells recognize tumors. The [results](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/367/6481/eaba7365) revealed that the treatment was safe in patients with advanced forms of cancer.

Meanwhile, the company CRISPR Therapeutics is currently running a global [phase I trial](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04035434) that is expected to recruit over 130 patients with blood cancer to test a CAR-T cell therapy made using CRISPR technology.

#### Cancer and aids

**Fernandez 21**, Clara RodrÍGuez FernÁNdez, 9-13-2021, "Eight Diseases That CRISPR Technology Could Cure", Labiotech.eu, https://www.labiotech.eu/best-biotech/crispr-technology-cure-disease/, accessed 9-18-2021, [Fernandez is Editor at Labiotech.eu] PHS-CB

There are several ways CRISPR could help us in the fight against AIDS. One is using CRISPR to [cut the viral DNA](https://www.genengnews.com/gen-news-highlights/crispr-eradicates-latent-hiv-1-offering-hope-of-functional-cures/81255839/?utm_medium=newsletter&utm_source=gen+news+highlights+of+the+week&utm_content=02&utm_campaign=gen+news+highlights+of+the+week_20180526&ajs_trait_oebid=9675b9130356b7s) that the HIV virus inserts within the DNA of immune cells. This approach could be used to attack the virus in its hidden, inactive form, which is what makes it impossible for most therapies to completely get rid of the virus.

Another approach could make us resistant to [HIV](https://www.labiotech.eu/tag/hiv/) infections. Certain individuals are born with a natural resistance to HIV thanks to a mutation in a gene known as CCR5, which encodes for a protein on the surface of immune cells that HIV uses as an entry point to infect the cells. The mutation changes the structure of the protein so that the virus is no longer able to bind to it.