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## 1

#### Interpretation: “medicines” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for a medicine or subset of medicines.

Nebel 19. [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution.” Vbriefly. August 12, 2019. <https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/?fbclid=IwAR0hUkKdDzHWrNeqEVI7m59pwsnmqLl490n4uRLQTe7bWmWDO_avWCNzi14> TG

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 universitiesz 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” – 1] upward entailment test – “member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines” doesn’t entail that member nations of the WTO ought to reduce IPP for drugs because it doesn’t prove that marijuana protections should be reduced 2] adverb test – adding “always” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning because reduce is permanent.

#### Violation: They spec \_\_\_\_\_\_

#### Standards:

#### [1] precision – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Independent voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### [2] Limits and ground – their model allows affs to defend anything from Covid vaccines to HIV drugs to Insulin— there's no universal DA since each has different functions and political implications — that explodes neg prep and leads to random medicine of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible — limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep and it takes out ground like DAs to certain medicines which are some of the few neg generics when affs spec medicines.

#### [3] TVA solves – you could’ve read your plan as an advantage under a whole res advocacy.

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate – all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to be justified.

#### Drop the debater – a] deter future abuse and b] set better norms for debate.

#### Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

## 2

#### The aff burden is to prove that the plan is a logical consequence and the neg burden is to disprove that

#### Prefer:

#### 1. Text – Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

[https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought //](https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought%20//)Massa

#### Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### 2. Debatability – a) my interp means debates focus on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years b) Moral oughts cannot guide action due to the is/ought fallacy – we cannot derive moral obligations from what happens in the real world

#### 3. Neg definition choice – The aff should have defined ought in the 1ac as their value, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

#### Negate:

#### [1] Intellectual is defined as “possessing or showing intellect or mental compacity” (Dictionary.com) but property cant possess intellect so the resolutions incoherent

#### [2] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t logically going to happen.

#### [3] member means “a body part or organ” (Marriam Webster) but a nation cannot have bodily organs so the resolutions incoherent

#### 4] Good Samaritan Paradox -- affirming negates because in order to say you want to fix x problem, that assumes x problem exists in the first place, thus eliminating IPR presupposes it exist which means negation is a prior question

#### 5] Zeno’s Paradox – motion is impossible, because moving half way causes half more and half more which is infinitely regressive and means elimination of IPR is logically impossible

#### **6]The holographic principle is the most reasonable conclusion**

Stromberg 15[Joseph Stromberg- “Some physicists believe we're living in a giant hologram — and it's not that far-fetched” <https://www.vox.com/2015/6/29/8847863/holographic-principle-universe-theory-physics> Vox. June 29th 2015] War Room Debate AI

Some physicists actually believe that the universe we live in might be a hologram. The idea isn't that the universe is some sort of fake simulation out of The Matrix, but rather that even though we appear to live in a three-dimensional universe, it might only have two dimensions. It's called the holographic principle. The thinking goes like this: Some distant two-dimensional surface contains all the data needed to fully describe our world — and much like in a hologram, this data is projected to appear in three dimensions. Like the characters on a TV screen, we live on a flat surface that happens to look like it has depth. It might sound absurd. But when physicists assume it's true in their calculations, all sorts of big physics problems — such as the nature of black holes and the reconciling of gravity and quantum mechanics — become much simpler to solve. In short, the laws of physics seem to make more sense when written in two dimensions than in three. "It's not considered some wild speculation among most theoretical physicists," says Leonard Susskind, the Stanford physicist who first formally defined the idea decades ago. "It's become a working, everyday tool to solve problems in physics." But there's an important distinction to be made here. There's no direct evidence that our universe actually is a two-dimensional hologram. These calculations aren't the same as a mathematical proof. Rather, they're intriguing suggestions that our universe could be a hologram. And as of yet, not all physicists believe we have a good way of testing the idea experimentally.

#### [7] Property means “a building” (Oxford Languages) so reducing intellectual buildings is incoherent

#### [8] Aff has an absolute burden of proof – any doubt means you negate since a claim not that claim can’t be true so any risk of falsity is entirely false.

## 3

#### Infrastructure is passing now and is at the top of Bidens agenda---Biden has enough PC but continuation is critical.

Nomikos 9/1 [William; 9/1/21; Assistant professor of political science at Washington University in St. Louis and director of the Data-driven Analysis of Peace Project; "*Everyone has an opinion on Afghanistan — Do voters care?*" The Hill, <https://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/politics/570422-everyone-has-an-opinion-on-afghanistan-do-voters-care>] Justin

On Aug. 15, Taliban fighters rolled into Kabul, the capital of Afghanistan. They faced little resistance. Within hours, the Taliban had seized control of the city. The airport plunged into chaos as thousands of Afghans sought refuge among departing American personnel. In February 2020, the Trump administration signed a peace agreement calling for the withdraw of American troops, but it is President Biden who ultimately pushed ahead and ended what he called “America’s longest war.” Even now, with the Taliban in Kabul, Biden remains defiant and defends his decision. Democrats worry this will hurt Biden politically, and Republicans are doing their best to make sure it does. But existing research suggests otherwise. Americans don’t prioritize foreign policy when voting International relations scholars long have argued that voters punish presidents who back down from confrontations with foreign adversaries, because doing so could tarnish the U.S.’s reputation abroad. But the magnitude of the effect on presidential approval varies depending on whether Democrats or Republicans are in power, the composition of the president’s constituency, and the persuasiveness of the justification for backing down. Indeed, as my own research has shown, the actual behavior of the president in crises may not matter at all. Ultimately, voters care about whether a president makes the right policy decisions, not whether American forces remain deployed abroad to maintain their reputation. What’s more, Americans are far more likely care about domestic issues such as health care or the economy than foreign policy. For example, even as Barack Obama rode opposition to the war in Iraq to electoral victory in 2008, more than five times as many respondents to the American National Elections Survey (ANES) listed the economy as the most important problem facing the nation compared to the war. Military interventions are unpopular with voters We tend to associate wars with “rally-around-the-flag” effects, in which conflicts lead to popularity bumps for presidents and their parties. Such effects may have been true during WWII, but 21st century military interventions are long, drawn out affairs — and political losers. This is due to what I’ve identified in past research as the time inconsistency between costs and benefits of military interventions. While the costs of intervention accrue immediately, both in terms of actual money as well as human lives, the best-case scenario benefits of intervention take decades, sometimes generations to bear fruit. For politicians facing election campaigns, this means that there is just no incentive to pay the costs of war up front when you might never see the benefits. In research I conducted on troop contributions to the war in Afghanistan, I found that contributors to the war effort — including the United States — withdrew around 10 percent of their forces whenever they were up for reelection. The politics of U.S. casualties Voters do care deeply about the loss of American lives. While images from Kabul evoke memories of Saigon and withdrawal from Vietnam, the more apt comparisons are the capture and failed rescue of U.S. hostages in Teheran following the Iranian revolution in 1979 or the Benghazi embassy attacks in Libya in 2011. Both the Iran hostage crisis and Benghazi negatively affected perception of two presidential candidates, Jimmy Carter and Hillary Clinton, respectively. Biden’s ability to avoid the political fallout might hinge on whether all Americans are evacuated safely. Sadly, this political calculus suggests there may be little room for humanitarian evacuations and refugee resettlements. While Biden has pledged to bring any trapped Americans home, there simply may not be much political incentive to evacuate Afghan refugees – especially if doing so endangers American lives. Moreover, accepting refugees means finding areas in the U.S. willing to resettle them. Conservative media commentators have already seized upon this issue, with one prominent pundit warning his viewers that they will be “invaded” by Afghan refugees. Biden’s political calculation Voters are not closely engaged with current events, often seeking to avoid politics altogether. Humanitarian disasters quickly disappear from headlines. Consider that less than a week after the Taliban overtook Kabul, news from Afghanistan did not make the front page of newspapers is several major cities. On the flip said, the potential costs of staying in Afghanistan would be enormous. Currently, President Biden is focused on getting Congress to pass a $1 trillion infrastructure bill and a $3.5 trillion budget reconciliation bill that, together, would comprise much of his first term agenda. Given the importance of these domestic issues to voters relative to foreign policy, passing the bills through Congress will be the most important politically for Biden. According to estimates, the war in Afghanistan alone has already cost American taxpayers more than $2.2 trillion. Concerns about the combined price tag of Democrats’ legislative agenda have triggered concerns about federal spending and inflation. More spending on Afghanistan would make Biden and his fellow Democrats even more vulnerable to such attacks. The slim margins in Congress suggests that Biden must reserve his political capital to maintain the existing coalitions to pass these two bills, not a new war effort. Doing so would also offer the Democrats the best chance for retaining control of Congress in the 2022 midterm elections.

#### Aff doesn’t solve but requires negotiations that saps PC.

Pooley 21 [James; Former deputy director general of the United Nations’ World Intellectual Property Organization and a member of the Center for Intellectual Property Understanding; “Drawn-Out Negotiations Over Covid IP Will Blow Back on Biden,” Barron’s; 5/26/21; <https://www.barrons.com/articles/drawn-out-negotiations-over-covid-ip-will-blow-back-on-biden-51621973675>] Justin

The Biden administration recently announced its support for a proposal before the World Trade Organization that would suspend the intellectual property protections on Covid-19 vaccines as guaranteed by the landmark TRIPS Agreement, a global trade pact that took effect in 1995.

The decision has sparked furious debate, with supporters arguing that the decision will speed the vaccine rollout in developing countries. The reality, however, is that even if enacted, the IP waiver will have zero short-term impact—but could inflict serious, long-term harm on global economic growth. The myopic nature of the Biden administration’s announcement cannot be overstated.

Even if WTO officials decide to waive IP protections at their June meeting, it’ll simply kickstart months of legal negotiations over precisely which drug formulas and technical know-how are undeserving of IP protections. And it’s unthinkable that the Biden administration, or Congress for that matter, would actually force American companies to hand over their most cutting-edge—and closely guarded—secrets.

As a result, the inevitable foot-dragging will cause enormous resentment in developing countries. And that’s the real threat of the waiver—precisely because it won’t accomplish either of its short-term goals of improving vaccine access and facilitating tech transfers from rich countries to developing ones. It’ll strengthen calls for more extreme, anti-IP measures down the road.

Experts overwhelmingly agree that waiving IP protections alone won’t increase vaccine production. That’s because making a shot is far more complicated than just following a recipe, and two of the most effective vaccines are based on cutting-edge discoveries using messenger RNA.

As Moderna Chief Executive Stephane Bancel said on a recent earnings call, “This is a new technology. You cannot go hire people who know how to make the mRNA. Those people don’t exist. And then even if all those things were available, whoever wants to do mRNA vaccines will have to, you know, buy the machine, invent the manufacturing process, invent creation processes and ethical processes, and then they will have to go run a clinical trial, get the data, get the product approved and scale manufacturing. This doesn’t happen in six or 12 or 18 months.”

Anthony Fauci, the president’s chief medical adviser, has echoed that sentiment and emphasized the need for immediate solutions. “Going back and forth, consuming time and lawyers in a legal argument about waivers—that is not the endgame,” he said. “People are dying around the world and we have to get vaccines into their arms in the fastest and most efficient way possible.”

Those claiming the waiver poses an immediate, rather than long-term, threat to IP rights also misunderstand what the waiver will—and won’t—do.

The waiver petition itself is more akin to a statement of principle than an actual legal document. In fact, it’s only a few pages long.

As the Office of the United States Trade Representative has said, “Text-based negotiations at the WTO will take time given the consensus-based nature of the institution and the complexity of the issues involved.” The WTO director-general predicts negotiations will last until early December.

That’s a lot of wasted time and effort. The U.S. Trade Representative would be far better off spending the next six months breaking down real trade barriers and helping export our surplus vaccine doses and vaccine ingredients to countries in need.

#### That solves existential climate change.

Castillo 21 [Rhyma; 8/16/21; News and politics writer at Elite Daily, where she's passionate about advocating for underserved communities throughout the United States. She’s covered issues in politics, immigration, environmental racism, climate change, gun violence, and more. After graduating with an English degree from Texas A&M Unversity, Rhyma has worked as a technical writer and test author at Educational Testing Service (ETS), a copywriter for Mightier Content, and as a Creative Operations Specialist at GoDaddy. She also has bylines as a freelancer at the San Antonio Current, where her reporting on local news, politics, tech, and entertainment has been widely circulated; “*Experts Explain What You Can Do About Climate Change After That Scary IPCC Report*,” Elite Daily, <https://www.elitedaily.com/news/what-you-can-do-climate-change-after-ipcc-report>] Justin

I’ll be honest: climate change is something I have a daily existential crisis over — and with its effects quite literally showing up on people’s doorsteps in the form of floods, wildfires, record heatwaves, and more, I know I’m not alone. On Aug. 9, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) released an alarming report that was characterized as a “code red for humanity,” which is terrifying, to say the least. But while it’s easy to surrender to fatalist feelings of doom and gloom, there’s still time to turn things around. So, according to experts, here’s what you can do about climate change after the IPCC report. While experts agree that reducing, reusing, and recycling on an individual level is important, they acknowledge it isn’t the main solution to climate change, which is a largely institutional problem. According to a 2017 report from the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP), researchers found that just 100 companies were responsible for over 70% of greenhouse gas emissions since 1988, with the top 10 emitters being fossil-fuel based energy corporations. “I'm not suggesting that individual actions aren't good or important,” states Cara Horowitz, J.D., the co-executive director of the Emmett Institute on Climate Change and the Environment at UCLA School of Law. She adds that if you’re lucky enough to afford an electric vehicle, to select the green option on your energy bill, or to adopt an environmentally sustainable diet, you should absolutely do so. However, she notes that “[climate change] is not a problem that can be solved by individual lifestyle choices.” At least, not in place of widespread social, political, and institutional change. “There is an attempt, and in some ways it's often quite deliberate, to make individuals think it's their fault climate change is happening — if only they made different lifestyle choices, if only they recycled more or ate less meat, we [could] solve this problem,” Horowitz says. But one of the most effective ways to address the climate crisis head-on, she states, is to push for institutional change. Lesley Ott, Ph.D., meteorological researcher at NASA’s Global Modeling and Assimilation Office at Goddard Space Flight Center, agrees. “There’s a limit on how much good or bad any one person can do,” to combat climate change, she states. “This is a situation that’s come from billions of people over decades and decades,” she adds. While she notes that its still important to limit your energy consumption, she acknowledges that large corporations, such as those involved in natural gas, animal agriculture, and product manufacturing, can do a much better job of reducing their emissions. “As climate change is affecting more and more of our infrastructure,” she states, “there are opportunities some companies [could seize] to say ‘hey, you know, I can probably do the right thing for the planet.’” Trained HazMat workers clean up miles oil-drench sand after an off-shore oil spill occurred, Februa... Ott also explains how the climate crisis is both a very difficult and a very simple issue. “It’s simple in that we know what’s causing it,” she says. “We know this is because of greenhouse gases, and we know where the greenhouse gases come from. But it's tricky because those things [that cause greenhouse gases] are so fundamental to many aspects of our lives.” Across the United States and world, many people have no choice but to depend on large energy monopolies for light, gas, and heat. And many people simply cannot afford to purchase electric vehicles, adopt environmentally sustainable diets, or live in neighborhoods where green energy options are available. So, what’s the solution? According to Ott, the answer is clear: “We need to change the way we consume energy,” she states. “We know the path that we need to go down to combat climate change. And it's really up to our political leaders in our country and others to marshal the response, and really put the procedures in place to do just that, to reduce our emissions,” she adds. If it were up to Gavin Schmidt, Ph.D., director of GISS and Principal Investigator for the GISS ModelE Earth System Model at NASA, he’d combat the climate crisis using several strategies: shutting down coal power stations, phasing out natural gas, electrifying transportation systems, investing in infrastructure for more walk-able and bike-able cities, building a more unified power grid, and pushing for improved public transit. But while scientists have developed the technology and resources for these strategies, Schmidt notes many places — including the United States — simply haven’t invested in the infrastructure necessary to adopt these strategies. “The infrastructure is not all there,” he states. So while we certainly have the concepts and resources available, “we're still missing some practical application [for] those things,” he adds. “We have to make the investments, [and] those investments take a while to come to fruition.”

## Case