# 1NC R3 Valley

## 1

### T

#### Interp: The affirmative may only garner offense from the hypothetical implementation of Resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.

#### Resolved requires policy action

Louisiana State Legislature <(https://www.legis.la.gov/legis/Glossary.aspx>) Ngong

Resolution

A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

#### We’ve inserted a list of the 164 members of the WTO

WTO ND. Members and Observers. https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\_e/whatis\_e/tif\_e/org6\_e.htm

Afghanistan — 29 July 2016 Albania — 8 September 2000 Angola — 23 November 1996 Antigua and Barbuda — 1 January 1995 Argentina — 1 January 1995 Armenia — 5 February 2003 Australia — 1 January 1995 Austria — 1 January 1995 B Bahrain, Kingdom of — 1 January 1995 Bangladesh — 1 January 1995 Barbados — 1 January 1995 Belgium — 1 January 1995 Belize — 1 January 1995 Benin — 22 February 1996 Bolivia, Plurinational State of — 12 September 1995 Botswana — 31 May 1995 Brazil — 1 January 1995 Brunei Darussalam — 1 January 1995 Bulgaria — 1 December 1996 Burkina Faso — 3 June 1995 Burundi — 23 July 1995 C Cabo Verde — 23 July 2008 Cambodia — 13 October 2004 Cameroon — 13 December 1995 Canada — 1 January 1995 Central African Republic — 31 May 1995 Chad — 19 October 1996 Chile — 1 January 1995 China — 11 December 2001 Colombia — 30 April 1995 Congo — 27 March 1997 Costa Rica — 1 January 1995 Côte d’Ivoire — 1 January 1995 Croatia — 30 November 2000 Cuba — 20 April 1995 Cyprus — 30 July 1995 Czech Republic — 1 January 1995 D Democratic Republic of the Congo — 1 January 1997 Denmark — 1 January 1995 Djibouti — 31 May 1995 Dominica — 1 January 1995 Dominican Republic — 9 March 1995 E Ecuador — 21 January 1996 Egypt — 30 June 1995 El Salvador — 7 May 1995 Estonia — 13 November 1999 Eswatini — 1 January 1995 European Union (formerly EC) — 1 January 1995 F Fiji — 14 January 1996 Finland — 1 January 1995 France — 1 January 1995 G Gabon — 1 January 1995 Gambia — 23 October 1996 Georgia — 14 June 2000 Germany — 1 January 1995 Ghana — 1 January 1995 Greece — 1 January 1995 Grenada — 22 February 1996 Guatemala — 21 July 1995 Guinea — 25 October 1995 Guinea-Bissau — 31 May 1995 Guyana — 1 January 1995 H Haiti — 30 January 1996 Honduras — 1 January 1995 Hong Kong, China — 1 January 1995 Hungary — 1 January 1995 I Iceland — 1 January 1995 India — 1 January 1995 Indonesia — 1 January 1995 Ireland — 1 January 1995 Israel — 21 April 1995 Italy — 1 January 1995 J Jamaica — 9 March 1995 Japan — 1 January 1995 Jordan — 11 April 2000 K Kazakhstan — 30 November 2015 Kenya — 1 January 1995 Korea, Republic of — 1 January 1995 Kuwait, the State of — 1 January 1995 Kyrgyz Republic — 20 December 1998 L Lao People’s Democratic Republic — 2 February 2013 Latvia — 10 February 1999 Lesotho — 31 May 1995 Liberia — 14 July 2016 Liechtenstein — 1 September 1995 Lithuania — 31 May 2001 Luxembourg — 1 January 1995 M Macao, China — 1 January 1995 Madagascar — 17 November 1995 Malawi — 31 May 1995 Malaysia — 1 January 1995 Maldives — 31 May 1995 Mali — 31 May 1995 Malta — 1 January 1995 Mauritania — 31 May 1995 Mauritius — 1 January 1995 Mexico — 1 January 1995 Moldova, Republic of — 26 July 2001 Mongolia — 29 January 1997 Montenegro — 29 April 2012 Morocco — 1 January 1995 Mozambique — 26 August 1995 Myanmar — 1 January 1995 N Namibia — 1 January 1995 Nepal — 23 April 2004 Netherlands — 1 January 1995 New Zealand — 1 January 1995 Nicaragua — 3 September 1995 Niger — 13 December 1996 Nigeria — 1 January 1995 North Macedonia — 4 April 2003 Norway — 1 January 1995 O Oman — 9 November 2000 P Pakistan — 1 January 1995 Panama — 6 September 1997 Papua New Guinea — 9 June 1996 Paraguay — 1 January 1995 Peru — 1 January 1995 Philippines — 1 January 1995 Poland — 1 July 1995 Portugal — 1 January 1995 Q Qatar — 13 January 1996 R Romania — 1 January 1995 Russian Federation — 22 August 2012 Rwanda — 22 May 1996 S Saint Kitts and Nevis — 21 February 1996 Saint Lucia — 1 January 1995 Saint Vincent and the Grenadines — 1 January 1995 Samoa — 10 May 2012 Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of — 11 December 2005 Senegal — 1 January 1995 Seychelles — 26 April 2015 Sierra Leone — 23 July 1995 Singapore — 1 January 1995 Slovak Republic — 1 January 1995 Slovenia — 30 July 1995 Solomon Islands — 26 July 1996 South Africa — 1 January 1995 Spain — 1 January 1995 Sri Lanka — 1 January 1995 Suriname — 1 January 1995 Sweden — 1 January 1995 Switzerland — 1 July 1995 T Chinese Taipei — 1 January 2002 Tajikistan — 2 March 2013 Tanzania — 1 January 1995 Thailand — 1 January 1995 Togo — 31 May 1995 Tonga — 27 July 2007 Trinidad and Tobago — 1 March 1995 Tunisia — 29 March 1995 Turkey — 26 March 1995 U Uganda — 1 January 1995 Ukraine — 16 May 2008 United Arab Emirates — 10 April 1996 United Kingdom — 1 January 1995 United States — 1 January 1995 Uruguay — 1 January 1995 V Vanuatu — 24 August 2012 Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of — 1 January 1995 Viet Nam — 11 January 2007 Y Yemen — 26 June 2014 Z Zambia — 1 January 1995 Zimbabwe — 5 March 1995

#### Four types of IP.

Ackerman 17 [Peter; Founder & CEO, Innovation Asset Group, Inc; “The 4 Main Types of Intellectual Property and Related Costs,” Decipher; 1/6/17; <https://www.innovation-asset.com/blog/the-4-main-types-of-intellectual-property-and-related-costs>] Justin

Intellectual property protection isn’t as simple as declaring ownership of a particular product or asset. In most countries, there are four primary types of intellectual property (IP) that can be legally protected: patents, trademarks, copyrights, and trade secrets. Each has their own attributes, requirements and costs. Before narrowing your focus on which form of protection to use, know that these forms of protection are not mutually exclusive. Depending on what you’re doing, you might be able to use a “belt & suspenders” approach and apply multiple forms of protection, or one approach might be the most sensible. Read the descriptions below to get some of the basics. Used to protect inventive ideas or processes – things that are new, useful and nonobvious - patents are what most often come to mind when thinking of IP protection. **Patents** are also used to protect newly engineered plant species or strains, as well. Procedure For most companies, patents result from the following stages: Conceptualization Typically, innovation teams work to address a common problem facing their organization, industry, or the world at large when developing their idea. When they’ve arrived at a solution or concept, they’ll draw up plans and gather the resources necessary to make it a reality. Prototypes or drawings can be created to provide a more accurate description of the end product or process. Invention Disclosure An internal review process often occurs with every invention. The innovation team consists of internal counsel and an invention review panel of varying disciplines. The reviewers assess, rate, rank, score, and highlight potential flaws in the supporting documents and descriptions for the invention, which are then addressed by the inventor. These reviews can and often do take place multiple times for a single invention. Patent Application If the invention is deemed meritorious enough for the pursuit of patent protection, some organizations prepare their own provisional or nonprovisional patent applications. Others will farm this stage out. There may be more tweaks as an application is prepared, and then submission to the appropriate patent office and the prosecution stage begins (the back & forth with the government patent office). Typically it is outside counsel that manages this process and related docketing activities. Docketing is the overarching name for activities that include management of paperwork and meeting filing deadlines specified by the government patent office. Because the application process is often very complicated, patent offices highly recommend working with experienced patent attorneys to handle this process. Maintenance Once a patent is approved, it has a finite lifetime. Patent holders are responsible for maintaining and tracking the usage of their patents and paying the appropriate periodic government renewal fees. If a given technology or other patented asset is collecting dust, you might not want to renew it. Instead, you can try and sell, license or donate it. Conversely, if a patented asset is performing well through product sales or licensing activities and its life is getting shorter, you might think about innovating ahead and maintaining competitive momentum. Costs Costs will vary depending on the country or countries where you file an application, and can run into tens of thousands of dollars depending on the invention’s complexity, plus attorney fees. Maintenance fees over the lifetime of the patent can run into thousands more per patent, per country where patent rights have been granted. You have to keep your eyes on these costs. Trademark A trademark is unlike a patent in that it protects words, phrases, symbols, sounds, smells and color schemes. Trademarks are often considered assets that describe or otherwise identify the source of underlying products or services that a company provides, such as the MGM lion roar, the Home Depot orange color scheme, the Intel Inside logo, and so on. Procedure Trademarks do not necessarily require government approval to be in effect; they can apply through abundant use in interstate commerce. Still, registration of a trademark affords far superior protection and is gained by filing an application with the proper government office. A trademark application requires the company or user to provide a clear description and representation of the mark and its uses in conjunction with associated products or services. As with patents, it’s a good idea to partner with outside counsel that specializes in trademark applications and/or search services so they can help ensure there is a clear path for your desired mark. Costs Trademarks are generally quite less expensive to obtain. According to the US Patent and Trademark Office, trademark registration currently costs between $225 and $325 for each class code you use per mark. Attorney and search fees are extra. There are also periodic (and relatively inexpensive) government maintenance fees for trademarks. Copyrights do not protect ideas, but rather the manner in which ideas are expressed (“original works of authorship”) - written works, art, music, architectural drawings, or even programming code for software (most evident nowadays in video game entertainment). With certain exceptions, copyrights allow the owner of the protected materials to control reproduction, performance, new versioning or adaptations, public performance and distribution of the works. Procedure Copyrights in general attach when the original works become fixed in a tangible medium, but should be registered with the government copyright office for optimal protection in the form of damages, injunctions and confiscation. Copyright registration applications are much simpler than patents or trademarks, and typically can be obtained by the author alone. The US Copyright Office encourages use of their online application system, and requires a sample of the work to be protected and some background information about the author. Costs Depending on the type of work being protected, currently fees vary between $25-$100 in the US. The most frequent copyright registration sought is for one work by one author, and costs about $35. Trade Secret Trade secrets are proprietary procedures, systems, devices, formulas, strategies or other information that is confidential and exclusive to the company using them. They act as competitive advantages for the business. Procedure There actually isn’t a federally-regulated registration process for trade secrets. Instead, the onus is on the company in possession of the secret to take necessary precautions to maintain it as such. This is an ongoing, proactive process and can include clearly marking relevant documents as “Confidential,” implementing physical and data security measures, keeping logs of visitors and restricting access. The issuance of nondisclosure agreements or other documented assurances of secrecy can also be employed. One of the first defenses typically put up when you assert that someone misappropriated your trade secret is that you failed to adequately treat it as a trade secret. Costs Though there are no official registration costs, there are costs associated with taking appropriate precautions and security measures. You must weigh the competitive significance of your secrets against the cost of protecting them.

#### Nations are defined territories with governments

**Merriam Webster** [Merriam Webster, 8-22-2021, accessed on 9-6-2021, Merriam-webster, "Definition of NATION", <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nation>] Adam

Definition of nation

 (Entry 1 of 2)

1a(1): [NATIONALITY sense 5a](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nationality)three Slav peoples … forged into a Yugoslavia without really fusing into a Yugoslav nation— Hans Kohn

(2): a politically organized [nationality](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nationality)

(3)in the Bible : a non-Jewish nationalitywhy do the nations conspire— Psalms 2:1 (Revised Standard Version)

b: a community of people composed of one or more [nationalities](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nationalities) and possessing a more or less defined territory and government Canada is a nation with a written constitution— B. K. Sandwell

c: a territorial division containing a body of people of one or more nationalities and usually characterized by relatively large size and independent statusa nation of vast size with a small population— Mary K. Hammond

2archaic : [GROUP](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/group), [AGGREGATION](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/aggregation)

3: a tribe or federation of tribes (as of American Indians)the Seminole Nation in Oklahoma

#### Reduce excludes elimination

Words and Phrases, 02 (vol 36B, p. 80) ///BDN

Mass. 1905. Rev.Laws, c.203, § 9, provides that, if two or more cases are tried together in the superior court, the presiding judge may “reduce” the witness fees and other costs, but “not less than the ordinary witness fees, and other costs recoverable in one of the cases” which are so tried together shall be allowed. Held that, in reducing the costs, the amount in all the cases together is to be considered and reduced, providing that there must be left in the aggregate an amount not less than the largest sum recoverable in any of the cases. The word “reduce,” in its ordinary signification, does not mean to cancel, destroy, or bring to naught, but to diminish, lower, or bring to an inferior state.—Green v. Sklar, 74 N.E. 595, 188 Mass. 363.

**Violation: they defend the inhuman and garner offense**

#### 1] Accessibility – changing the topic post facto structurally favors the aff by making neg prep, which is based on the resolution, useless – the judge can only make a meaningful decision when both sides have had an equal opportunity.  It allows someone to specialize in one area 4 years giving an huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months, which means their arguments are presumptively false because they haven’t been subject to well-researched clash.

#### Procedural fairness is a voter and outweighs a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is a game and equity is necessary to sustain the activity, b] probability – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but it can rectify skews, c] internal link turns every impact – a limited debate promotes research and engagement d] All your arguments concede fairness since you assume they will be esvaluated fairly.

#### 2] Clash – forfeiting government action sanctions retreat from controversy and forces the negative to concede solvency before winning a link -- clash is the necessary condition for distinguishing debate from discussion, but negation exists on a sliding scale -- that jumpstarts the process of critical thinking, reflexivity, and argument refinement.

#### TVA:

#### 1] 1AC Chen is the TVA—read an aff that defends getting rid of biopiracy

#### 2] Policy aff that has an advantage that defends getting rid of the concept of patents- ie how native knowledge should be shared but its considered property

#### The plan would collapse the entire pharma system predicated on exploitation – even if the plan isn’t everything – it’s a critical step on the process of what Fanon terms “complete disorder”.

Ahmed 20 A Kavum Ahmed 6-24-2020 "Decolonizing the vaccine" <https://africasacountry.com/2020/06/decolonizing-the-vaccine> (A. Kayum Ahmed is Division Director for Access and Accountability at the Open Society Public Health Program in New York and teaches at Columbia University Law School.)//Duong+Elmer

Reflecting on a potential COVID-19 vaccine trial during a television interview in April, a French doctor stated, “If I can be provocative, shouldn’t we be doing this study in Africa, where there are no masks, no treatments, no resuscitation?” These remarks reflect a colonial view of Africa, reinforcing the idea that Africans are non-humans whose black bodies can be experimented on. This colonial perspective is also clearly articulated in the alliance between France, The Netherlands, Germany and Italy to negotiate priority access to the COVID-19 vaccine for themselves and the rest of Europe. In the Dutch government’s announcement of the European vaccine coalition, they indicate that, “… the alliance is also working to make a portion of vaccines available to low-income countries, including in Africa.” In the collective imagination of these European nations, Africa is portrayed as a site of redemption—a place where you can absolve yourself from the sins of “vaccine sovereignty,” by offering a “portion of the vaccines” to the continent. **Vaccine sovereignty reflects how European and American governments use public funding**, supported by the pharmaceutical industry and research universities, **to obtain priority access to** potential COVID-19 **vaccines**. The concept symbolizes the **COVID**-19 **vaccine** (when it eventually becomes available) **as** an **instrument of power deployed to exercise control** over who will live and who must die. **In order to counter vaccine sovereignty**, **we must decolonize the vaccine**. Africans have a particular role to play in leading this decolonization process as subjects of colonialism and as objects of domination through coloniality. Colonialism, as an expansion of territorial dominance, and coloniality, as the continued expression of Western imperialism after colonization, play out in the vaccine development space, most notably on the African continent. So what does decolonizing the vaccine look like? And how do we decolonize something that does not yet exist? **For** Frantz **Fanon**, “**Decolonization**, which sets out to change the order of the world, **is**, obviously, a **program of complete disorder**.” Acknowledging that the COVID-19 vaccine has been weaponized as an instrument of power by wealthy nations, decolonization requires a Fanonian program of radical re-ordering. In the context of vaccine sovereignty, this re-ordering **necessitates** the **dismantling** of the **profit-driven biomedical system**. This program starts with de-linking from Euro-American constructions of knowledge and power that reinforce vaccine sovereignty through the profit-driven biomedical system. Advocacy campaigns such as the “People’s Vaccine”, which **calls for guaranteed free access to COVID**-19 **vaccines**, diagnostics and treatments to everyone, everywhere, are a good start. Other mechanisms, such as the World Health Organization’s COVID-19 Technology Access Pool, similarly supports universal access to COVID-19 health technologies as global public goods. Since less than 1% of vaccines consumed in Africa are manufactured on the continent, **regional efforts to develop vaccine manufacturing capacity** such as those **led by** the **Africa** Center for Disease Control and Prevention, as well as the Alliance of African Research Universities, **must be supported**. These efforts collectively advance delinking and **move** us closer **toward** the **re-ordering of systems of power**. The opportunity for disorder is paradoxically enabled by the COVID-19 pandemic, which has permitted moments of existential reflection in the midst of the crisis. A few months ago, a press release announcing the distribution of “a portion of the vaccines” to Africans, may have been lauded as European benevolence. But in the context of a pandemic that is more likely to kill black people, Africa’s reliance on Europe for vaccine handouts is untenable, necessitating a re-examination of the systems of power that hold this colonial relationship in place. The Black African body appears to be good enough to be experimented on, but not worthy of receiving simultaneous access to the COVID-19 vaccine as Europeans. Consequently, Africans continue to feel the effects of colonialism and white supremacy, and understand the pernicious nature of European altruism. By reinforcing the current system of vaccine research, development and manufacturing, it has become apparent that European governments want to retain their colonial power over life and death in Africa through the COVID-19 vaccine. Resistance to this colonial power requires the decolonization of the vaccine.

#### Only state engagement stops the worst excesses of cybernetics.

Hughes 2 (James, PhD in Public Policy @ Trinity College. “Democratic Transhumanism 2.0” <http://www.changesurfer.com/Acad/DemocraticTranshumanism.htm> //shree)

What then of arguments from within the transhumanist worldview? First, state action is required to address catastrophic threats from transhumanist technologies. Most transhumanists acknowledge that nanotechnology, genetic engineering and artificial intelligence could cause catastrophes if used for terrorist or military purposes, or accidentally allowed to reproduce in the wild. Contemplation of these catastrophic scenarios has led prominent transhumanists, such as Max More the founder and president of the Extropy Institute, to move away from libertarianism and to endorse prophylactic government policies. Requiring nanotechnology firms to take out insurance against the accidental destruction of the biosphere just isn’t very practical. What insurance policy covers accidental destruction of the biosphere? How could the externalities of bioterrorism be internalized into a cost accounting of a gene therapy firm? Only governments are in a position to create the necessary levels of prophylaxis, and most transhumanists can agree on this point. Second, only believable and effective state-based policies to prevent adverse consequences from new technologies will reassure skittish publics that they do not have to be banned. Because of the weakness of social democracy in the U.S., current technology policy is dominated by ignorant hysteria on one side and greed on the other, politicians feeding off of populist Luddite hysteria and corporate anti-regulatory lobbyists. Publics must be offered a choice other than that of unfettered free-market technology versus bans. If transhumanists do not acknowledge the legitimacy of regulation, and attempt to craft and support responsible legislation, they cede the field to the Luddites. These choices require strong social democratic governments, such as those of Europe, that can act independent of corporate interests and vocal extremists. We need a strong social democratic regulatory apparatus that does not block transhuman technologies for Luddite reasons, but that also will ensure that transhuman technologies are safe and effective. The case of cryonics shows how spectacular frauds or iatrogenic disasters can set back acceptance of transhuman technology altogether. Human enhancements must be proven safe before being used, but not held hostage to vague Luddite anxieties. Third, social policies must explicitly address public concerns that biotechnology will exacerbate social inequality. Libertarian transhumanists have a forceful answer to the challenge that biotechnology will be used for totalitarian applications: in a liberal society, each individual will choose for themselves whether to adopt the technologies. But what is their answer to the threat of growing class polarization? Biotechnologies will make it possible for the wealthy to have healthier, stronger, more intelligent and longer-lived children. Overcoming popular resistance to technology will require not only assuring publics that they are safe and will not be forced on anyone, but also that there will be universal, equitable access to their benefits through public financing. In other words, genetic choice and enhancement technologies must be included in a national health insurance program. Nanotechnology and artificial intelligence will also exacerbate inequality by contributing to structural unemployment through automation. Work will be increasingly unnecessary in the 21st century. If techno-optimists do not work to ameliorate structural unemployment through expansions in the welfare state, job retraining, establishing a shorter work-week and work-life, and a guaranteed social income, then we are likely to see the return of old-school Luddism, machine-smashing by the unemployed. Fourth, monopolistic practices and overly restrictive intellectual property law can seriously delay the development of transhuman technologies, and restrict their access. Applications of intellectual property law that are over-generous to corporations may restrict access to information and tools in ways that slow innovation. By engaging with law and public policy, transhumanists can protect the public commons in biomedical information essential to the advance of science. Fifth, only a strong liberal democratic state can ensure that posthumans are not persecuted. The posthuman future will be as threatening to unenhanced humans as gay rights or women’s liberation have been to patriarchs and homophobes, or immigrant rights are to nativists. While libertarian transhumanists may imagine that they will be able to protect themselves if they are well-armed and have superior reflexes, they will be severely outnumbered. Nor is civil war an attractive outcome. Rather transhumanists must understand their continuity with the civil rights movements of the past and work to build coalitions with sexual, cultural, racial and religious minorities to protect liberal democracy. We need a strong democratic state that protects the right of avantgarde minorities to innovate and experiment with their own bodies and minds. Transhumanists must also come to some terms with congenial wing of the animal rights movement since, like animal rights, transhumanism is opposed to anthropocentrism. But rather than rights for all life, transhumanist ethics seeks to establish the solidarity of and citizenship for all intelligent life. Transhumanists look forward to a society in which humans, post-humans and intelligent non-humans are all citizens of the polity. Consistent with this would be the demands of the Great Ape Project for an extension of human level protections to the great apes. Sixth, libertarian transhumanists are inconsistent in arguing for the free market. The dominant argument for the free market on the part of libertarian transhumanists comes from Hayek: that the market is a naturally evolved, emergent phenomenon without conscious guidance, which allocates resources better than planning. But the goal of transhumanism is precisely to supplant the natural with the planned, replacing chance with design. The key to transhumanism is faith in reason, not in nature. In any case, the assertion that the market s naturally evolved while governance structures and polities are artificial impositions on nature is bad sociology. All functioning markets require norms, rules, laws, legislatures, police, courts and planning. All democratic polities require the action of millions of autonomous agents aggregating their interests, expressing themselves in voluntary behavior, and creating an emergent political system. The market is not any more natural than democracy, even if being “natural” was a transhumanist virtue.

#### 1 – SSD solves offense – if you read this on neg as a counter methodology

#### 2 – any DA to the TVA negates – proves that there’s workable clash under my interp.

#### DTD- T is question of models of debate

#### No impact turns – a. higher layer bc it indicts the aff b. baiting c. illogical

#### CI- they have to proactively to justify their model

## 2

### Theory

#### Interpretation: when evidence is introduced in round, it must be read as a full cut card and not paraphrased.

#### Violation: they paraphrase – Billious Pills.

#### Standards:

#### 1)  Evidence Ethics- Paraphrasing reduces ev to biased two-sentence summaries – proven by the widespread use of misconstrued evidence. Cards ensure tags are grounded in direct quotes and make it easier to check for misrepresentation which deters cheating.

#### Independently true of their Billious Pills card – read their evidence for anywhere it talks about a “gimmick” – that’s independently bad because it is their first example of how the patent system has been gamed.

That’s an IVI- A] Credibility B] Longevity C] Truth Testing

#### 2) Prep skew- If we want to know the quote of their evidence, not only does it require us to use prep time while they don’t have to, but it also takes longer to read through the parts they paraphrased than our quotes.

DTD to deter future abuse and set good norms

CI – reasonability is arbitrary and collapses

No RVI – illogical, and encourages baiting

Don’t let them weigh case against this argument

## 3

### NC

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the rez is true or false – anything else moots 7 min of the NC – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – true/false binary is descriptive and technical.

#### Negate because either the aff is true meaning its bad for us to clash with it because it turns us into fake news people OR it’s not meaning it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true so it's constitutive and jurisdictional.

#### I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

#### The resolution is incoherent:

#### 1] Merrian websters defines to as

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/to

to preposition Save Word To save this word, you'll need to log in. Log In \ tə, tu̇, ˈtü \ Definition of to (Entry 1 of 3) 1a—used as a function word to **indicate movement** or an action or condition suggestive of movement toward a place, person, or thing reached

#### But the inhuman can’t move to an obligations so rez is incoherent

#### 2] Neg definition choice-anything else moots 7 mins of the 1NC since I premised my engagement on your lack of a definition, they had a chance to define the resolution in the 1AC but didn’t.

#### **3] 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.

#### 4] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to the aff which means it’s impossible to have complete tolerance for an idea since that tolerance relies on excluding a perspective.

#### 6] The Place Paradox- if everything exists in a place in space time, that place must also have a place that it exists and that larger place needs a larger location to infinity. Therefore, identifying ought statements is impossible since those statements assume acting on objects in the space-time continuum.

#### 7] Grain Paradox- A single grain of millet makes no sound upon falling, but a thousand grains make a sound. But a thousand nothings cannot make something which means the physical world is paradoxical.

#### 8] Arrows Paradox- If we divide time into discrete 0-duration slices, no motion is happening in each of them, so taking them all as a whole, motion is impossible.

#### 9] Bonini’s Paradox- As a model of a complex system becomes more complete, it becomes less understandable; for it to be more understandable it must be less complete and therefore less accurate. Therefore no philosophical or political model can be useful.

# Case

### 1NC – Presumption

Vote neg on presumption:

1 – Burden of proof -- academics and activists already analyze our relation to technology outside of debate and Sosa already read their 1AC -- no reason a ballot in a random tournament achieves any transformative potential.

2 – No correlation -- voting aff does not “enact” the case into solvency -- any reason to vote aff must be solved by an affirmative ballot -- all previous victories by Harun disprove solvency.

#### 3 – No risk of solvency -- stats prove.

Ritter 13. (JD from U Texas Law (Michael J., “Overcoming The Fiction of “Social Change Through Debate”: What’s To Learn from 2pac’s Changes?,” National Journal of Speech and Debate, Vol. 2, Issue 1)

The structure of competitive interscholastic debate renders any message communicated in a debate round virtually incapable of creating any social change, either in the debate community or in general society. And to the extent that the fiction of social change through debate can be proven or disproven through empirical studies or surveys, academics instead have analyzed debate with nonapplicable rhetorical theory that fails to account for the unique aspects of competitive interscholastic debate. Rather, the current debate relating to activism and competitive interscholastic debate concerns the following: “What is the best model to promote social change?” But a more fundamental question that must be addressed first is: “Can debate cause social change?” Despite over two decades of opportunity to conduct and publish empirical studies or surveys, academic proponents of the fiction that debate can create social change have chosen not to prove this fundamental assumption, which—as this article argues—is merely a fiction that is harmful in most, if not all, respects. The position that competitive interscholastic debate can create social change is more properly characterize5d as a fiction than an argument. A fiction is an invented or fabricated idea purporting to be factual but is not provable by any human senses or rational thinking capability or is unproven by valid statistical studies. An argument, most basically, consists of a claim and some support for why the claim is true. If the support for the claim is false or its relation to the claim is illogical, then we can deduce that the particular argument does not help in ascertaining whether the claim is true. Interscholastic competitive debate is premised upon the assumption that debate is argumentation. Because fictions are necessarily not true or cannot be proven true by any means of argumentation, the competitive interscholastic debate community should be incredibly critical of those fictions and adopt them only if they promote the activity and its purposes

#### 4 – No chance any grab for power succeeds -- leftist hackers get bodied by the NSA

Fredrik deBoer 16, Limited-Term Lecturer, Introductory Composition at Purdue Program, 3/15/16, “c’mon, guys,” http://fredrikdeboer.com/2016/03/15/cmon-guys/

I could be wrong about the short-term dangers, and the stakes are incredibly high. But in the end we’re left with the same old question: what tactics will actually work to secure a better world?

In a sharp, sober piece about the meaning of left-wing political violence in the 1970s, Tim Barker writes “If you can’t acknowledge radical violence, radicals are reduced to mere victims of repression, rather than political actors who made definite tactical choices under given political circumstances.” The problem, as Barker goes on to imply, is those tactical choices: in today’s America they will essentially never break on the side of armed opposition against the state. The government knows everything about you, I’m sorry to say, your movements and your associations and the books you read and the things you buy and what you’re saying to the people you communicate with. That’s simply on the level of information, before we even get to the state’s incredible capacity to inflict violence. Look, the world has changed. The relative military capacity of regular people compared to establishment governments has changed, especially in fully developed, technology-enabled countries like the United States. The Czar had his armies, yes, but the Czar’s armies depended on manpower above and beyond everything else. The fighting was still mostly different groups of people with rifles shooting at each other. If tomorrow you could rally as many people as the Bolsheviks had at their revolutionary peak, you’re still left in a world of F-15s, drones, and cluster bombs. And that’s to say nothing of the fact that establishment governments in the developed world can rely on the numbing agents of capitalist luxuries and the American dream to damper revolutionary enthusiasm even among the many millions who have been marginalized and impoverished. This just isn’t 1950s Cuba, guys. It’s just not. In a very real way, modern technology effectively lowers the odds of armed political revolution in a country like the United States to zero, and so much the worse for us. This isn’t fatalism. It doesn’t mean there’s no hope. It means that there is little alternative to organization, to changing minds through committed political action and using the available nonviolent means to create change: a concert of grassroots organizing, labor tactics, and partisan politics. Those things aren’t exactly likely to work, either, but they’re a hell of a lot more plausible than us dweebs taking the Pentagon. Bernie Sanders isn’t really a socialist, but he’s a social democrat that moves the conversation to the left, and if people are dedicated and committed to organizing, the local, state, and national candidates he inspires will move it further to the left still. You got any better suggestions? Listen, commie nerds. My people. I love you guys. I really do. And I want to build a better world. Not incrementally, either, but with the kind of sweeping and transformative change that is required to fix a world of such deep injustice. But seriously: none of us are ever going to take to the barricades. And it’s a good thing, too, because we’d probably find a way to shoot in the wrong direction. I can’t dribble a basketball without falling down. American socialism is largely made up of bookish dreamers. I love those people but they’re not for fighting. And even if you have a particular talent for combat, you’re looking at fighting the combined forces of Google, Goldman Sachs, and the defense industry. Violence is hard. Soldiering is hard. In an era of the NSA and military robots, it’s really, really hard. “Should we condone revolutionary violence?” is dorm room, pass-the-bong conversation fodder, of precisely the moral and intellectual weight of “should we torture a guy if we know there’s a bomb and we know he knows where it is and we know we can stop it if we do?” It’s built on absurd hypotheticals, propped up by the power of anxious machismo, and undertaken to no practical political end. It’s understandable. I get it, I really do. But it’s got nothing to do with us. The only way forward is the grubby, unsexy work of building coalitions and asking people to climb on board.

#### 5 – Make them prove how the inhuman can reduce IP.

Marcellin 16 Marcellin, Sherry (Professor, London School of Economics). The political economy of pharmaceutical patents: US sectional interests and the African Group at the WTO. Routledge, 2016./SJKS

In July 1988, prior to the Montreal Mid-Term Review, DCs had sensed that the approach being proposed by industrialised countries was desirable on the grounds that the alternative would be a proliferation of unilateral or bilateral actions (MTN.GNG/NG11/8: 31). These NITs maintained that acceptance of such an approach would be tantamount to creating a licence to force, in the name of trade, modifications in standards for the protection of IP in a way that had not been found acceptable or possible so far in WIPO (ibid). Brazil subsequently informed the Group that on October 20, 1988, unilateral restrictions had been applied by the US to Brazilian exports as a retaliatory measure in connection with an IP issue; that this type of action seriously inhibited Brazil’s participation in the work of the Group, since ‘no country could be expected to participate in negotiations while experiencing pressures on the substance of its position’ (MTN.GNG/NG11/10: 27). The Brazilian delegate maintained that such action by the US constituted a blatant infringement of GATT rules and was contrary to the Standstill commitment of the Punta del Este Declaration. ‘The United States action was an attempt to coerce Brazil to change its intellectual property legislation, and furthermore represented an attempt by the United States to improve its negotiating position in the Uruguay Round’ (ibid). A US delegate countered that the measures had been taken with regret and as a last resort after all alternative ways of defending legitimate US interests had been exhausted, and that the US further believed that the adoption of effective patent protection was in Brazil’s own interest (ibid: 28). The US had therefore applied its strategy of coercive unilateralism against one of the two most important players championing the cause of the South in the TRIPS negotiations, the other being India. Apprehensive about the resistance of this dominant Southern duo, the United States sought to utilise its market size as a bargaining tool to secure changes to national IP regimes. It therefore decided to impact the more powerful of the two at the time, thereby indirectly admonishing India and the entire coalition against strengthened IP rules, as well as their domestic export constituencies who would be affected by US decisions to restrict imports. Moreover, because Brazil and India appeared to be collaborating extensively in maintaining a united front, a resulting strain on Brazil’s economy would likely affect their co-operation. However, since market opening and closure have been treated as the currency of trade negotiations in the post-war period (Steinberg 2002: 347), the move to place restrictions on Brazilian exports by the largest consumer market in the GPE should not have been entirely unanticipated. Brazil was also the regional leader in South America and disciplining it would send an unequivocal warning to other South American countries (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002: 136), including Argentina, Chile and Peru who were also active participants in the negotiations. This would mark the start of a series of coercive strategies aimed at compliance with the US private-sector envisioned GATT IPP.

### 1NC – Thesis

#### T/L – yes link – conceding cybernetics causes new tech innovations.

#### Err AFF because our brains are wired for techno-pessimism – the solution to bad tech is more tech.

Reinhart 18 (Will Rinehart is Director of Technology and Innovation Policy at the American Action Forum, where he specializes in telecommunication, Internet, and data policy, with a focus on emerging technologies and innovation. Rinehart previously worked at TechFreedom, where he was a Research Fellow. He was also previously the Director of Operations at the International Center for Law & Economics. In Defense of Techno-optimism. 10-10-2018. <https://techliberation.com/2018/10/10/in-defense-of-techno-optimism/> //shree) Recut Justin

Many are understandably pessimistic about platforms and technology. This year has been a tough one, from Cambridge Analytica and Russian trolls to the implementation of GDPR and data breaches galore. Those who think about the world, about the problems that we see every day, and about their own place in it, will quickly realize the immense frailty of humankind. Fear and worry makes sense. We are flawed, each one of us. And technology only seems to exacerbate those problems. But life is getting better. Poverty continues nose-diving; adult literacy is at an all-time high; people around the world are living longer, living in democracies, and are better educated than at any other time in history. Meanwhile, the digital revolution has resulted in a glut of informational abundance, helping to correct the informational asymmetries that have long plagued humankind. The problem we now face is not how to address informational constraints, but how to provide the means for people to sort through and make sense of this abundant trove of data. These macro trends don’t make headlines. Psychologists know that people love to read negative articles. Our brains are wired for pessimism. In the shadow of a year of bad news, it helpful to remember that Facebook and Google and Reddit and Twitter also support humane conversations. Most people aren’t going online to talk about politics and if you are, then you are rare. These sites are places where families and friends can connect. They offer a space of solace – like when chronic pain sufferers find others on Facebook, or when widows vent, rage, laugh and cry without judgement through the Hot Young Widows Club. Let’s also not forget that Reddit, while sometimes a place of rage and spite, is also where a weight lifter with cerebral palsy can become a hero and where those with addiction can find healing. And in the hardest to reach places in Canada, in Iqaluit, people say that “Amazon Prime has done more toward elevating the standard of living of my family than any territorial or federal program. Full stop. Period” Three-fourths of Americans say major technology companies’ products and services have been more good than bad for them personally. But when it comes to the whole of society, they are more skeptical about technology bringing benefits. Here is how I read that disparity: Most of us think that we have benefited from technology, but we worry about where it is taking the human collective. That is an understandable worry, but one that shouldn’t hobble us to inaction. Nor is technology making us stupid. Indeed, quite the opposite is happening. Technology use in those aged 50 and above seems to have caused them to be cognitively younger than their parents to the tune of 4 to 8 years. While the use of Google does seem to reduce our ability to recall information, studies find that it has boosted other kinds of memory, like retrieving information. Why remember a fact when you can remember where it is located? Concerned how audiobooks might be affecting people, Beth Rogowsky, an associate professor of education, compared them to physical reading and was surprised to find “no significant differences in comprehension between reading, listening, or reading and listening simultaneously.” Cyberbullying and excessive use might make parents worry, but NIH supported work found that “Heavy use of the Internet and video gaming may be more a symptom of mental health problems than a cause. Moderate use of the Internet, especially for acquiring information, is most supportive of healthy development.” Don’t worry. The kids are going to be alright. And yes, there is a lot we still need to fix. There is cruelty, racism, sexism, and poverty of all kinds embedded in our technological systems. But the best way to handle these issues is through the application of human ingenuity. Human ingenuity begets technology in all of its varieties. When Scott Alexander over at Star Slate Codex recently looked at 52 startups being groomed by startup incubator Y Combinator, he rightly pointed out that many of them were working for the betterment of all: Thirteen of them had an altruistic or international development focus, including Neema, an app to help poor people without access to banks gain financial services; Kangpe, online health services for people in Africa without access to doctors; Credy, a peer-to-peer lending service in India; Clear Genetics, an automated genetic counseling tool for at-risk parents; and Dost Education, helping to teach literacy skills in India via a $1/month course. Twelve of them seemed like really exciting cutting-edge technology, including CBAS, which describes itself as “human bionics plug-and-play”; Solugen, which has a way to manufacture hydrogen peroxide from plant sugars; AON3D, which makes 3D printers for industrial uses; Indee, a new genetic engineering system; Alem Health, applying AI to radiology, and of course the obligatory drone delivery startup. Eighteen of them seemed like boring meat-and-potatoes companies aimed at businesses that need enterprise data solution software application package analytics targeting management something something something “the cloud”. As for the other companies, they were the kind of niche products that Silicon Valley has come to be criticized for supporting. Perhaps the Valley deserves some criticism, but perhaps it deserves more credit than it’s been receiving as-of-late. Contemporary tech criticism displays a kind of anti-nostalgia. Instead of being reverent for the past, anxiety for the future abounds. In these visions, the future is imagined as a strange, foreign land, beset with problems. And yet, to quote that old adage, tomorrow is the visitor that is always coming but never arrives. The future never arrives because we are assembling it today. We need to work diligently together to piece together a better world. But if we constantly live in fear of what comes next, that future won’t be built. Optimism needn’t be pollyannaish. It only needs to be hopeful of a better world.

#### Technological progress is self-sustaining and corrective

**Teixeira** 3-7-**2017** – PhD in sociology @ U W-Madison, author or co-author of six books (Ruy, “The Optimistic Leftist: Why the 21st Century Will Be Better Than You Think,” Kindle Reader)

Of course, Naam's views may be rejected by some on the left because he is unabashedly a techno- optimist. Well, what's wrong with that? The fact of the matter is that almost everything people like about the modern world, including relatively high living standards, is traceable to technological advances and the knowledge embodied in those advances. From smart phones, flat screen TVs and the internet to air and auto travel to central heating and air conditioning to the medical devices and drugs that cure disease and extend life to electric lights and the mundane flush toilet—the list is endless—technology has dramatically transformed people's lives, making them both much better and much longer than they ever have been before. It is difficult to argue that the average person today is not far, **far better off** than her counterpart in the past. As the Northwestern University economic historian Joel Mokyr puts it, the so-called good old 42 days were old but they were not good. And what do we have to thank for all these spectacular advances? Technology! Technology has both enabled the new goods, machines, medicine and so on that we consume and enabled the economic growth that allows us to consume at such a high level. Of course, economists debate endlessly about the exact mechanisms connecting technology to growth and what social and institutional conditions must be met for technology to maximize its effect on growth, but at the end of the day the growth we have seen—and the living standards we enjoy—would simply not have been possible without the massive breakthroughs and continuous improvements we have seen in the technological realm. Given all this and given the central importance of economic growth to the left's prospects, one would think that the left would embrace techno- optimism rather than shying away from it. After all, if the goal is to be successful and improve people's lives, rapid technological advance is surely something to promote enthusiastically. But the left has been oddly circumspect about the possibilities of new and better technologies, allowing the techno-optimism space to be dominated by libertarian-minded denizens of Silicon Valley.43 As British science journalist Leigh Phillips puts it: Once upon a time, the left ... promised more innovation, faster progress, greater abundance. One of the reasons I believe that the historically fringe ideology of libertarianism is today so surprisingly popular in Silicon Valley and with tech-savvy young people more broadly ... is that libertarianism is the only extant ideology that so substantially promises a significantly materially better future. There are several reasons for the left's ambiguous relationship to technology. One has already been mentioned: the left has tended to underestimate the importance of economic growth in the recent past, believing incorrectly that they can achieve their social objectives in an era of a tepid and poorly distributed growth. That leads naturally to an underestimation of the importance of technological change, since one of its chief attributes is promoting growth. Second, and worse, many on the left tend to regard technological change with dread rather than hope. They see technology as a force facilitating inequality rather than growth, disadvantaging manual workers rather than leading to skilled job creation, turning consumers into corporate pawns rather than information-savvy citizens and destroying the planet in the process. We are far, far away from the traditional left attitude that welcomed technological change as the handmaiden of abundance and increased leisure. Or, for that matter, from the liberal optimism that permeated the culture of the 1950s and '60s with tantalizing visions of flying cars and obedient robots. Third, the left has become infected with general pessimism about prospects for growth, acceding, as we have seen, to the idea that growth can't really be much greater than it already is. Just as this devalues the role of policy it also devalues the role of technological change. Why be optimistic about technological change if it's not likely to have much effect anyway? Feeding right into these sentiments is the growth of academic techno-pessimism. The leading light in this emerging school of thought is economist Robert Gordon, coincidentally in the same department at Northwestern University where leading techno-optimist Mokyr teaches. In his 2012 paper, "Is Economic Growth Over?: Faltering Innovation Confronts the Six Headwinds," and then in a number of follow-up papers and a massive book, Gordon argues that economic growth on the level we've been used to in the last 200 years may in fact be a historical anomaly and that strong growth has only been possible because of dramatic new innovations that have turbocharged economic advance—"industrial revolutions" in his terminology.45 The first industrial revolution was 1750—1830, based around steam engines, cotton spinning and railroads. The second revolution was 1870—1900, featuring electricity, the internal combustion engine and running water with indoor plumbing. He believes that both these industrial revolutions took about 100 years to work their way through the economy and generate their full effects. For example, the second industrial revolution was still giving us advances like air conditioning, home appliances and the interstate highway system in the 1950—70 period. The third industrial revolution is centered on computers and the internet. Gordon is not impressed with this revolution. He thinks all the really important, transformative stuff came from the first two revolutions, especially the second. He is fond of posing this question in his public lectures: which would you be willing to give up, your iPhone or the flush toilet? He thinks the post-1970 slowdown in productivity growth (it dropped by about half) is traceable to the relative triviality of the computer/internet revolution. And when we finally got a burst of productivity growth in the 1996—2004 period, it quickly petered out. The reason, he believes, is that the third industrial revolution has already run out of gas (no 100-year phase-in here) and just doesn't have much more to give us. Because of this and because of his six "headwinds" to growth (demographic burdens, stagnating educational attainment, high levels of inequality, globalization, rising energy and environmental costs, and high levels of household and government debt), he projects an ongoing decline in per capita economic growth to a meager 0.2 percent per year this century. But is it really true that all the cool stuff has already been invented? This does not seem likely. Mokyr points to emerging fields of innovation such as 3-D printing, genetic modification and custom- designed materials.46 There is also the rapid development of self-driving cars and ever-more sophisticated robots and artificial intelligence systems. Even more significantly, technology related to the generation and storage of clean energy has been advancing by leaps and bounds. For example, the price of solar power has been declining exponentially for years; according to Naam, the price of electricity from new solar declines by about 16 percent every time solar capacity doubles.4Z And progress has also been extremely rapid in making battery storage of renewable energy inexpensive, reliable and large- scale. Surely cheap, renewable energy qualifies as a breakthrough innovation. More generally, it is worth noting that by the end of the twentieth century more technological advances had been made in the previous hundred years than in all of history before 1900. As physicist Michio Kaku argues in his book Visions: How Science Will Revolutionize the 21st Century, there is no good reason to believe that this breakneck pace will slow in the twenty-first century, since we are just on the verge of mastering knowledge gleaned from technological revolutions in three interwined areas: computer science, biomolecular science/engineering, and quantum physics 48 Indeed, as we transition from an era where we have discovered the basic laws and building blocks in these fields to an era where we apply that knowledge, the pace of innovation, if anything, may accelerate. Currently underdeveloped fields like biotechnology, nanotechnology and quantum computing may leap forward in ways we cannot exactly anticipate but that are likely to have a big impact. Rather than correctly predicting a long-term innovation slowdown, it seems more likely that Gordon and his co-thinkers will join the long list of economic pessimists that have been proven wrong over the last 150 years.49 As blogger Kevin Drum cogently puts it: I can somehow imagine a circa-1870 version of Gordon arguing that all this folderol about electricity is ridiculous. Why, we've been studying electricity for over a century, and what do we have to show for it? Some clunky batteries, the telegraph, a few arc lamps with limited use, and a steady supply of techno-optimist inventors who keep telling us that any day now they'll invent a practical generator that will replace steam engines and change the world. Don't believe it, folks. 5 Interestingly, Drum, despite his bracing critique, is himself a sort of techno-pessimist—or, more precisely, a pessimistic techno-optimist. In an influential article for Mother Jones magazine, provocatively titled "Welcome Robot Overlords: Please Don't Fire Us?" Drum envisions robots growing smarter and more capable at an exponential rate so that by, say 2040, there will not be much need for human workers.51 Result: mass unemployment and social dysfunction despite unprecedented technological advance. Thus Drum goes to the other extreme from Gordon. Not only will there not be an innovation slowdown but there will be such a drastic innovation speedup that it will put everybody out of work. But this is just as unrealistic as Gordon. As Anthony Carnevale and Stephen Rose point out in their detailed study of the technological transformation of the U.S. economy, instead of assuming a virtual vanishing of growth as Gordon does, Drum is implicitly assuming economic growth in the neighborhood of 10 percent per year as smart machines generate greater and greater 52 output without human intervention. This seems unlikely to say the least. Yet this point of view is not without influence on the left, where a sort of neo-Luddism has become increasingly common. Drum himself has remarked: "The Luddites weren't wrong. They were just 200 years too early."53 Martin Ford's 2015 book, Rise of the Robots: Technology and the Threat of a Jobless Future, which predicts half of U.S. workers will be replaced by robots in the next 20 years, was widely 54 and respectfully reviewed in liberal outlets. Coming after a spell of high unemployment from the Great Recession, which is just lifting in the United States (and still hasn't in much of Europe), this seems like a very odd thing for those on the left to worry about. It is especially odd when the history of technological advance is full of transformations that put workers out of jobs in one sector only to have more jobs created in others as demand for new products and services grew.55 It's time for the left to discard both the Gordon and Drum forms of techno-pessimism and firmly embrace techno-optimism. Continuing technological advance is not only probable but good; instead of a future of no jobs it will be a future of different and more highly skilled jobs. These advances will likely transform our lives dramatically—in some ways we can already see and some we cannot anticipate. **They will be a key to human liberation and critically to the growth that will facilitate the pursuit of social justice and a higher standard of living for all**. Techno-optimism is too important to be left to the libertarians.

Tech is inevitable – we all use it to avoid COVID, so rejection reentranches disease and leads to net MORE exclusion, but it’s good for activists to connect and create resistance to governments. Their own participation proves it’s inevitable AND their use of it for competitive merit proves their argument is a moral hazard

### 1NC – Heg Good

#### The United States has been the *largest cause* of the decline internationally—any other reading interprets singular actions *NOT* structural system effects – great power competition increases the risk of *rampant* colonialism by all major actors

Deudney & Ikenberry 15 (Daniel Deudney, Johns Hopkins University G. John Ikenberry, Princeton University “America’s Impact: The End of Empire and the Globalization of the Westphalian System”, August 2015, http://scholar.princeton.edu/sites/default/files/gji3/files/am-impact-dd-gji-final-1-august-2015.pdf)

Over the last two and a half centuries, the most important change in the international political system has been the decline of empire, and the simultaneous spread of the Westphalian system of sovereign states, from Europe to universal global scope. Empire – the direct coercive rule of one people over another – has almost vanished from world politics. 1 Where once the world was made up of regional systems – most of which were empires – the contemporary world is marked by a large number of sovereign states, now nearly two hundred. 2 Over these centuries, one state – the United States – initially at the periphery of the European imperial system, has become the most powerful and influential state in the system. There are many debates about America in the international system. One prominent argument developed extensively, particularly by recent historians, is that the United States is, and has been throughout its history, imperial and an empire. This view is widely held by many, both inside and outside the United States. In this view, the United States continued the Western imperial project as European empires faltered in the 20th century, and in the second half of the 20th century created the last and most extensive empire with global reach.3 Arguments along these lines are of more than just of academic interest because they connect to national identity narratives in many parts of the world, including the rising states of China and India, which emphasize anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism, as well as grievances against Western imperialism.4 In this paper, we challenge this view and offer a different account of the American impact on the world which emphasizes that the United States has played a key role in the decline of empire and the globalization of the Westphalian system. In contrast to those who view the United States as an empire, and thus as essentially antagonistic to the Westphalian sovereign state system, we argue that the United States, in an overall ledger sheet of impacts, has been influential against imperialism and colonialism, and has been powerfully supportive of the spread of the Westphalian system. We argue that contemporary views of the United States as imperial profoundly misrepresent the overall impact the United States has had on the international system over the last two and a half centuries. In this paper, we lay out the evidence for how the United States has played a major and often decisive role as an anti-imperial and anti-colonial force. More than any other state in the system, we argue, the United States has undermined empire and spread of the Westphalian system. Of course, the decline of empire and the spread of the Westphalian system are the result of many forces, including the diffusion of military capabilities, the growth of the international trading system, the rise of nationalism, and the spread of anti-colonial and human rights norms have all played powerful roles in diminishing the effectiveness of imperialism and the attractiveness and longevity of empires.5 But efforts to create empires continued well into the 20th century, and their lack of success stemmed not just from these broader trends in ideas and power but also from the grand strategies of the leading states – most notably the United States – in directly opposing the creation and perpetuation of empires. To be sure, the United States has been imperial and briefly had an empire in some times and places. But these episodes, we argue, are greatly overshadowed in their overall impact by American anti-imperialism and anticolonialism. And the global spread of the Westphalian system, by no means solely resulting from American actions, has been more advanced by American foreign policies than of any other state in the system. There are four broad reasons why the American role as anti-imperial and pro Westphalian have been underappreciated. First, many view the liberal international order, which the United States has played such a pivotal role in creating over the 20th century, as a challenge to the Westphalian system and a replacement for it, rather than an addition to it. Second, America’s centrality in the globalization of the Westphalian system through the thwarting and dismantlement of empire has been obscured by the widespread tendency to conceive of Europe and the United States as together making up “the West.”6 This makes it all too easy to see Europe’s centuries of imperialism being continued by the United States. In contrast, we argue that a major dynamic in world politics has pitted an “old West” of European imperialisms against the anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism of a “new West” in America. Third, the historical literature on modern empire building widely identifies two waves of activity (the first from the 16th century to the early 19th century, and the second from the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th). We identify two additional waves of empire building, in the World Wars and then in the Cold War. When these two additional waves are brought back into the picture, the case for seeing the United States as anti-imperial and anti-colonial is significantly strengthened, since the United States played such a prominent role in thwarting and dismantling these late-empire building efforts. Fourth, many contemporary observers of America’s impact on the world focus on infamous moments when the United States did exercise crude imperial behavior: in the many military interventions and covert actions in Latin America and the Middle East over the last century and, most saliently, the 2003 American invasion of Iraq. We do not seek to ignore or justify these episodes and patterns of behavior. The United States has been imperial in some ways and in some instances. But we seek to place them in the context of what we argue is America’s more significant impact on the organization of the global system.

#### US leadership solves everything.

Jain 19, senior fellow with the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security, where he oversees the Atlantic Council’s Democratic Order Initiative and D10 Strategy Forum; and Matthew Kroenig, deputy director for strategy in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security and associate professor of government and foreign service at Georgetown University (Ash, “Present at the Re-Creation: A Global Strategy for Revitalizing, Adapting, and Defending a Rules-Based International System,” *Atlantic Council*, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Present-at-the-Recreation.pdf>)

The system must also be adapted to deal with new issues that were not envisioned when the existing order was designed. Foremost among these issues is emerging and disruptive technology, including AI, additive manufacturing (or 3D printing), quantum computing, genetic engineering, robotics, directed energy, the Internet of things (IOT), 5G, space, cyber, and many others. Like other disruptive technologies before them, these innovations promise great benefits, but also carry serious downside risks. For example, AI is already resulting in massive efficiencies and cost savings in the private sector. Routine tasks and other more complicated jobs, such as radiology, are already being automated. In the future, autonomous weapons systems may go to war against each other as human soldiers remain out of harm’s way. Yet, AI is also transforming economies and societies, and generating new security challenges. Automation will lead to widespread unemployment. The final realization of driverless cars, for example, will put out of work millions of taxi, Uber, and long-haul truck drivers. Populist movements in the West have been driven by those disaffected by globalization and technology, and mass unemployment caused by automation will further grow those ranks and provide new fuel to grievance politics. Moreover, some fear that autonomous weapons systems will become “killer robots” that select and engage targets without human input, and could eventually turn on their creators, resulting in human extinction. The other technologies on this lisgt similarly balance great potential upside with great downside risk. 3D printing, for example, can be used to “make anything anywhere,” reducing costs for a wide range of manufactured goods and encouraging a return of local manufacturing industries.61 At the same time, advanced 3D printers can also be used by revisionist and rogue states to print component parts for advanced weapons systems or even WMD programs, spurring arms races and weapons proliferation.62 Genetic engineering can wipe out entire classes of disease through improved medicine, or wipe out entire classes of people through genetically engineered superbugs. Directed-energy missile defenses may defend against incoming missile attacks, while also undermining global strategic stability. Perhaps the greatest risk to global strategic stability from new technology, however, comes from the risk that revisionist autocracies may win the new tech arms race. Throughout history, states that have dominated the commanding heights of technological progress have also dominated international relations. The United States has been the world’s innovation leader from Edison’s light bulb to nuclear weapons and the Internet. Accordingly, stability has been maintained in Europe and Asia for decades because the United States and its democratic allies possessed a favorable economic and military balance of power in those key regions. Many believe, however, that China may now have the lead in the new technologies of the twenty-first century, including AI, quantum, 5G, hypersonic missiles, and others. If China succeeds in mastering the technologies of the future before the democratic core, then this could lead to a drastic and rapid shift in the balance of power, upsetting global strategic stability, and the call for a democratic- led, rules-based system outlined in these pages.63

#### Yes transition war.

Min-hyung Kim 20. Department of Political Science and International Relations, Kyung Hee University, Seoul, South Korea. “A real driver of US–China trade conflict: The Sino–US competition for global hegemony and its implications for the future” Emerald Insight. 02-04-2019. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/ITPD-02-2019-003/full/html> // Re-Cut Justin

Underlying these arguments for an inevitable war between the two superpowers is PTT. PTT originally formulated by Organski (1958) posits that **war is likely** when the power of the dominant state in the international system (i.e. hegemon) is **declining** and that a dissatisfied rising challenger **substantially reduces the power gap between the hegemon and itself**. Unlike balance of power theory, PTT argues that the war is most likely when there is near power parity between a dominant state and a rising and dissatisfied challenger (Organski and Kugler, 1980, pp. 19-20)[5]. A rising power here is generally dissatisfied with the existing international order and **initiates war against a declining hegemon in order to impose orders that are more favorable to itself** (Organski 1958, pp. 364-367). Layne (2018, p. 110) put these power transition dynamics quite succinctly as follows: “Over time, however, the relative power of states changes, and eventually the international order no longer reflects the actual distribution of power between or among the leading Great Powers. When that happens, the legitimacy of the prevailing order is called into question, and it will be challenged by the rising power(s).” And when the balance of power between a dominant state and a rising challenger changes sufficiently, a new order replaces an old one typically **by a hegemonic war** (2018, p. 104). Paying close attention to the **growing Sino–US competition** over hegemony in the twenty-first century, therefore, Shirk (2007, p. 4), China specialist, argues that “History teaches us that rising powers are likely to provoke war.” On the other hand, scholars like Gilpin (1981) contend that the power transition war between great powers is likely to occur when a hegemonic state whose power is declining due to imperial overstretch[6] views “**preventive war as the most attractive means of eliminating the threat** posed by challengers” (Ned Lebow and Valentino, 2009, p. 391), although they do acknowledge that there might be some “ways to prolong the period of its power preponderance vis-à-vis the rising challenger, so that the rapidly rising power will not dare to challenge the hegemonic leadership” (Kim and Gates, 2015, p. 221). In this case, the initiator of war is a declining hegemon, rather than a rising challenger. The declining hegemon who fears a rising challenger’s overtaking its power in the near future **sees war as a better option** than other options of maintaining its hegemony such as reducing its commitments abroad and appeasing a rising challenger.
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