#### Overview:

1. **No new 2n arguments, weighing, and paradigm issues. a) overloads the 2AR with a massive clarification burden b) it becomes impossible to check NC abuse if you can dump on reasons the shell doesn't matter in the 2n. And, neg has access to bidirectional shells which makes neg shells impossible to meet and impact turns your reading of the shells since I’ll always lose on an interpretation. And, aff gets an automatic RVI on take-outs to theory since it proves they shouldn’t have read it and should be punished for trying to purposefully make the round uneducational with a cheap violation**
2. **Neg debater is synonyms with Miller Roberts, Miller, 1NC, and any interp they set – key to debatibility**

#### Curry’s Modus Ponens – any consequent is valid given the existence of self-justified antecedent. Shapiro, Lionel and Beall, Jc, "Curry's Paradox", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*(Summer 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/curry-paradox/>. //Massa

**Suppose** that your friend tells you: **“If what I’m saying using this very sentence is true, then time is infinite”.** It turns out that there is a short and seemingly compelling argument for the following conclusion: (P)**The mere existence of your friend’s assertion entails** (or has as a consequence) **that time is infinite**. Many hold that (P) is beyond belief (and, in that sense, paradoxical), even if time is indeed infinite. Or, if that isn’t bad enough, consider another version, this time involving a claim known to be false. Let your friend say instead: “If what I’m saying using this very sentence is true, then all numbers are prime”. Now, *mutatis mutandis*, the same short and seemingly compelling argument yields (Q): (Q)The mere existence of your friend’s assertion entails (or has as a consequence) that all numbers are prime. (Q)The mere existence of your friend’s assertion entails (or has as a consequence) that all numbers are prime. **Here is the argument for**[**(P)**](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/curry-paradox/#exP). Let kk be the self-referential sentence your friend uttered, simplified somewhat so that it reads “If kk is true then time is infinite”. In view of what kk says, we know this much: (1)Under the supposition that kk is true, it is the case that if k is true then time is infinite. But, of course, we also have. (2)Under the supposition that kk is true, it is the case that k is true. **Under the supposition that kk is true, we have thus derived a conditional together with its antecedent.** Using modus ponens within the scope of the supposition, we now **derive** the conditional’s consequent under that same supposition: (3)Under the supposition that **kk is true,** it is the case that time is infinite. The rule of conditional proof now entitles us to affirm a conditional with our supposition as antecedent: (4)**If kk is true then time is infinite.** **But, since (4) just is kk itself**, we thus have. (5)**kk is true**. Finally, putting (4) and (5) together by modus ponens, we get (6)**Time is infinite**. We seem to have established that time is infinite using no assumptions beyond the existence of the self-referential sentence kk, along with the seemingly obvious principles about truth that took us to (1) and also from (4) to (5). And the same goes for [(Q)](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/curry-paradox/#exQ), since we could have used the same form of argument to reach the false conclusion that all numbers are prime.

### Offense:

#### Advocacy: I contend that the member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce patent protections for medicines that lack a “a meaningfully different characteristic” from previous medicines.. Presumption and permissibility affirms since if I told you my name you’d believe me absent a reason not to and we’d have to justify morally neutral actions like drinking water. Check all interps and K/DA links in CX – 1) avoids infinite regress due to links and interps 2) otherwise reevlaute under the neg’s K 3) norms – you’d do the same with TFW

#### The plan solves medical product hopping.

Daniel Burke 18. Cleveland-Marshall College of Law. “An Examination of Product Hopping by Brand-Name Prescription Drug Manufacturers: The Problem and a Proposed Solution” Cleveland State Law Review. Volume 66; Issue 2; Article 8. 04-01-18. <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3995&context=clevstlrev> brett

Additionally, a legislative solution to the issue of product hopping may prove efficacious. Congress should enact a statute that treats the reformulation of an existing drug as a monopolistic practice per se. Such a statute would have the effect of placing the burden on the brand-name manufacturer to show that the new drug has a meaningfully different characteristic. The bar for “meaningfully different” should be established with the goal of preventing the practice of product hopping in the future. That is, the test should be fairly difficult to meet if the brand-name manufacturer has submitted a new drug to treat the same illness that its previous drug treated. The prescription drug manufacturer should have to demonstrate clinically relevant improvements with regard to the new drug’s formulation, method in which it is administered, effectiveness, or potential side effects before a patent may be granted on a drug.

While this requirement may seem unfair to brand-name drug manufacturers, it is a feasible way to dissuade product hopping, which has been shown to drive the increase in healthcare costs and ultimately harm consumers.207 The FDA is the proper agency to deal with this determination given its current position of being the regulator tasked with approving pharmaceutical drugs. Enacting a statute to effectuate this result should have the effect of minimizing product hopping issues. If litigated, because the presumption is that the new drug is equivalent to the former drug, the brand-name manufacturer would have to demonstrate to the court that that presumption is erroneous to avoid a finding of a violation of the Sherman Act.

Finally, a legislative solution to the issue of product hopping will allow the United States Patent and Trademark Office to better decide these issues instead of the courts. The United States Patent and Trademark Office, employing thousands of patent examiners who each have a technical degree making him or her a subject matter expert, is better equipped to resolve issues.208 Requiring a more substantive difference from the prior iteration of the drug when determining whether to grant a new patent will help prevent inherently anticompetitive conduct in the pharmaceutical industry and will benefit consumers of prescription drugs by lowering their cost and encouraging larger leaps in therapeutic effectiveness to occur.

#### Drug prices are skyrocketing -- ending product hopping is key.

Michael A. Carrier & Steve Shadowen 17. \*\*Michael A. Carrier is a Distinguished Professor at Rutgers Law School and has testified to Congress on drug-pricing issues. \*\*Steve Shadowen is regularly recognized as a top national antitrust lawyer, a result of his dedicated work on cases where intellectual property and antitrust law intersect, including several groundbreaking cases in the pharmaceutical industry. “Pharmaceutical Product Hopping: A Proposed Framework For Antitrust Analysis” Health Affairs. 06-01-17. https://www.healthaffairs.org/do/10.1377/hblog20170601.060360/full/

Skyrocketing drug prices are in the news. Overnight price increases have riveted the attention of the public, media, and politicians of all stripes. But one reason for high prices has flown under the radar. When drug companies reformulate their product, switching from one version of a drug to another, the price doesn’t dramatically increase. Instead, it stays at a high level for longer than it otherwise would have without the switch. Although more difficult to discern than a price spike, this practice, when undertaken to prevent generic market entry, can result in the unjustified continuation of monopoly pricing, burdening patients, the government, and the health care system as a whole. Not all reformulations pose competitive concerns. Empirical studies have shown that more than 80 percent can be explained by improvements that are not temporally connected to impending generic entry. But a dangerous subset of such reformulations is undertaken for one, and only one, reason: to delay generic entry. In such cases, reformulation is called “product hopping.” When generics enter the market, the price can fall dramatically overnight, by as much as 85 percent. For that reason, brand firms have every incentive to delay this moment of reckoning as long as possible. Sure enough, making trivial changes to their drugs has that effect. Every state has a substitution law that requires or allows pharmacists to offer a generic drug when the patient presents a prescription for a brand drug. But such substitution is thwarted if the drug is not the same—in particular, if it is not bioequivalent (able to be absorbed into the body at the same rate) and therapeutically equivalent (having the same active ingredient, form, dosage, strength, and safety and efficacy profile). A minor change to a drug’s formulation can prevent the pharmacist from substituting the generic. Product hopping raises nuanced issues arising at the intersection of patent law, antitrust law, the federal Hatch-Waxman Act, and state drug product substitution laws. It is even more complex given the uniquely complicated pharmaceutical market, in which the buyer (patient, insurance company) is different from the decision maker (doctor). Courts applying US antitrust law have struggled to create a robust and defensible legal framework for separating anticompetitive product hops from competitively benign, legitimate product development. In this post, we propose a framework that would help courts defer to legitimate reformulations while targeting anticompetitive switches.

#### Each instance costs one billion dollars annually.

CAPD 20. “New Report Quantifies the Harm of Product Hopping to Patients and the U.S. Health Care System” Coalition for Affordable Prescription Drugs. 09-14-20. <https://www.affordableprescriptiondrugs.org/new-report-quantifies-the-harm-of-product-hopping-to-patients-and-the-u-s-health-care-system/>

\*The study evaluates the costs of 5 instances of product hopping/evergreening which cost 4.7 billion dollars annually

Product hopping is a practice commonly used by pharmaceutical companies to extend the life of their patents, and as a result, the period of time they can charge high prices for their drugs. Normally, after an initial, patent-protected monopoly period, new drugs face competition from identical drugs manufactured and sold by other companies as a generic. This competition drives down drug prices for patients as a result. But with product hopping, when the drug is supposed to go generic, the drug company instead makes a minor tweak to the drug and rebrands it. Drug companies market this practice as “innovation,” but don’t be fooled. This practice really just allows the manufacturer to put what is essentially the same drug back on the market as a “new” drug, push patients onto that materially same drug at a higher price and take advantage of charging patients high monopoly prices a second time. A new report from Matrix Global Advisors (MGA) helps illustrate the impact these harmful tactics have on patients seeking access to affordable medicines. According to the findings, just five instances of product hopping – for the brand drugs Prilosec, TriCor, Suboxone, Doryx, and Namenda – cost patients and the U.S. health care system $4.7 billion annually. However, it’s not just the billions of additional dollars that patients have to pay for their drugs—it’s also the cost shouldered by employers, unions, and government programs that help pay for health coverage. These higher costs push premiums higher, limit wage growth for working Americans, and force higher spending on U.S. taxpayers—all so pharmaceutical companies can get a second bite at the apple.

#### Rising healthcare costs compromise 17% of GDP---the current trajectory is unsustainable and makes collapse inevitable.

Ron Howrigon 16. President and CEO of Fulcrum Strategies, Masters in Economics from North Carolina State University, has held Senior Management level positions with three of the largest Managed Care Companies in the country, including Kaiser Permanente, CIGNA HealthCare and BlueCross BlueShield, former Director of Community Medical Services with Kaiser Permanente. “Flatlining: How Healthcare Could Kill the US Economy.”

In 2010, the United States GDP was $15 trillion. The total healthcare expenditures in the United States for 2010 were $2.6 trillion. At $2.6 trillion, the U.S. healthcare market has moved up from 15th and now ranks as the 5th largest world economy, just behind Germany and just ahead of both France and the United Kingdom. That means that while healthcare was only 5% of GDP in 1960, it has risen to over 17% of GDP in only 50 years.

Over that same time, the Defense Department has gone from 10% of GDP to less than 5% of GDP. This means that in terms of its portion of the US. economy, defense spending has been reduced by half while healthcare spending has more than tripled.

If healthcare continues to trend at the same pace it has for the last 50 years, it will consume more than 50% of the US. economy by the year 2060. Every economist worth their salt will tell you that healthcare will never reach 50% of the economy. It’s simply not possible because of all the other things it would have to crowd out to reach that point. So, if we know healthcare can’t grow to 50% of our economy, where is the breaking point? At what point does healthcare consume so much of the economy that it breaks the bank, so to speak?

This is the big question when it comes to healthcare. If something doesn’t happen to reverse the 50-year trend we’ve been riding, when will the healthcare bubble burst? How bad will it be and how exactly will it happen? While no one knows the exact answers to those questions, economists and healthcare experts agree that something needs to happen, because we simply can’t continue on this trend forever.

Another way to look at healthcare is to study its impact on the federal budget and the national debt. In 1998, federal healthcare spending accounted for 19% of the revenue taken in by the government. Just eight years later, in 2006, healthcare spending had increased to 24% of federal revenue. In 2010, the Affordable Healthcare Act passed and signiﬁcantly increased federal spending for healthcare—so much so that in 2016, healthcare spending accounted for almost one-third of all revenue received by the government and surpassed Social Security as the largest single budget category. What makes this trend even more alarming is the fact that revenue to the federal government doubled from 1998 to 2016. That means healthcare spending by the federal government has almost quadrupled in terms of actual dollars in that same time period. If this trend continues for the next 20 years, healthcare spending will account for over half the revenue received by the government by the year 2035. Again, that simply can’t happen without causing signiﬁcant issues for the ﬁnancial wellbeing of our country.

In recent history, the U.S. economy has experienced the near catastrophic failure of two major market segments. The ﬁrst was the auto industry and the second was the housing industry. While each of these reached their breaking point for different reasons, they both required a signiﬁcant government bailout to keep them from completely melting down. What is also true about both of those market failures is that, looking back, it’s easy to see the warning signs. What happens if healthcare is the next industry to suffer a major failure and collapse?

It’s safe to say that a healthcare meltdown would make both the automotive and housing industries’ experiences seem minor in comparison. While that may be hard to believe, it becomes clear if you look at the numbers. The auto industry contributes around 3.5% of this country’s GDP and employs 1.7 million people. This industry was deemed “too big to fail” which is the rationale the U.S. government used to ﬁnance its bail out. From 2009 through 2014, the federal government invested around $80 billion in the U.S. auto industry to keep it from collapsing. Healthcare is ﬁve times larger than the auto industry in terms of its percentage of GDP, and is ten times larger than the auto industry in terms of the number of people it employs.

The construction industry (which includes all construction, not just housing) contributes about 6% of our country’s GDP and employs 6.1 million people. Again, the healthcare market dwarfs this industry. It’s three times larger in terms of GDP production and, with 18 million people employed in the healthcare sector, it’s three times larger than construction in this area, too.

These comparisons give you an idea of just how signiﬁcant a portion healthcare comprises of the U.S. economy. It also begins to help us understand the impact it would have on the economy if healthcare melted down like the auto and housing industries did. So, let’s continue the comparison and use our experience with the auto and housing industries to suggest to what order of magnitude the impact a failure in the healthcare market would cause our economy.

The bailout in the auto industry cost the federal government $80 billion over ﬁve years. Imagine a similar failure in healthcare that prompted the federal government to propose a similar bailout program. Let’s imagine the government felt the need to inject cash into hospital systems and doctors’ ofﬁces to keep them aﬂoat like they did with General Motors. Since healthcare is ﬁve times the size of the auto industry, a similar bailout could easily cost in excess of $400 billion. That’s about the same amount of money the federal government spends on welfare programs. To pay for a bailout of the healthcare industry, we’d have to eliminate all welfare programs in this country. Can you imagine the impact it would have on the economy if there were suddenly none of the assistance programs so many have come to rely upon?

When the housing market crashed, it caused the loss of about 3 million jobs from its peak employment level of 7.4 million in 1996. Again, if we transfer that experience to the healthcare market, we come up with a truly frightening scenario. If healthcare lost 40% of its jobs like housing did, it would mean 7.2 million jobs lost. That’s more than four times the number of people who are employed by the entire auto industry—an industry that was considered too big to be allowed to fail.

The loss of 7.2 million jobs would increase the unemployment rate by 5%. That means we could easily top the all-time high unemployment rate for our country. In November of 1982, the U.S. unemployment rate was 10.8%. A failure in the healthcare sector could push unemployment to those levels or higher. The only time in our country’s history when unemployment was higher was during the Great Depression. It should also be noted that in 1982, home mortgage interest rates were close to 20%! The U.S. Federal Funds Rate, or the interest rate the government pays on our national debt, was also close to 20% in 1982.

Economists fear that a large increase in unemployment could cause interest rates to escalate to levels approaching those of the early 1980s. If that were to happen today, with a $19 trillion national debt, it would mean that our annual debt service would be $3.8 trillion. Keep in mind that the federal government only takes in $3.4 trillion in total revenue. That’s right, in our nightmare scenario where healthcare fails and eliminates 7.2 million jobs, which pushes unemployment above 10% and causes interest rates to climb to almost 20%, we would be in a situation where the interest payments on our current debt would be more than our entire federal tax revenue. Basically, we would be Greece, but on a much larger scale.

Ok, now it’s time to take a deep breath. I’m not convinced that healthcare is fated to unavoidable failure and economic catastrophe. That’s a worst-case scenario. The problem is that at even a fraction the severity of the auto or housing industry crises we’ve already faced, a healthcare collapse would still be devastating. Healthcare can’t be allowed to continue its current inﬂationary trending. I believe we are on the verge of some major changes in healthcare, and that how they’re implemented will determine their impact on the overall economic picture in this country and around the world. Continued failure to recognize the truth about healthcare will only cause the resulting market corrections to be worse than they need to be.

I don’t want to diminish the pain and anguish that many people caught up in the housing crash experienced. I think an argument can be made, though, that if the healthcare market crashes and millions of people end up with no healthcare, the resulting fallout could be much worse than even the housing crisis.

#### Extinction.

Stein Tønnesson 15. Research Professor, Peace Research Institute Oslo; Leader of East Asia Peace program, Uppsala University, 2015. “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace.” International Area Studies Review, Vol. 18, No. 3, p. 297-311.

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party.

Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.

### Middleview:

#### 1. The neg must concede definitions and interpretations as contextualized in the aff a) causes regress since we can infinitely debate what something means but the aff speaks first which means they should define it b) moots 6 mins of the aff if you alter the way arguments function.

#### 2. The neg may not read nibs or OCIs (offensive counterinterps) a) you can up-layer for 7 minutes that I have to answer before I even have access to offense b) inf neg abuse since you would just read 7 mins of auto-negate arguments c) OCIs are just shorter theory args they can blow up. This means they must only line by line aff arguments, since otherwise they function as nibs before I access warrants. No neg analytics - I don’t have time to cover 100 blippy arguments in the NC since you can read 7 min of analytics and extend any of them to win. No neg arguments – skews me to answer those. Answering this triggers a contradiction since it relies on an analytic argument and those affirm since I spoke first and they were your fault for creating.

#### 3. The neg may not read meta-theory – I only have time to check abuse 1 time but you can do it in the nc and 2n, up-layering my attempt means we never get to the best norm. This means reject any reason why an aff spike is bad since they claim aff theory is unfair. Can’t vote neg to exacerbate the skew a) pf non-verifiable b) doesn’t guarantee change c) only evaluate individual rounds, since external things can’t be verified

#### 4. The neg may not make theory arguments in the 2n a) overloads the 2ar with a massive clarification burden b) impossible to check abuse if the 2n can just dump on the shell for 6 minutes, c) overloads the 2ar with no risk shells. And, reject out of round violations since a) you can pull up someone saying the f word and reading the k which polarizes argumentation and means someone always loses b) not jurisdictional since the judge can only vote for the better debate, the violation doesn't happen in round.

#### 5. The neg may not read overview answers to aff arguments – they can up-layer all aff arguments for 7 minutes and the 1ar has to shift through it all. I have a computer virus that prevents changing font size and everything’s in an overview.

#### 6. 1AR theory paradigm issues – a) AFF gets it because otherwise the neg can engage in infinite abuse, making debate impossible, b) drop the debater – the 1AR is too short for theory and substance so ballot implications are key to check abuse, c) no RVIs – they can stick me with 6min of answers to a short arg and make the 2AR impossible, d) competing interps – 1AR interps aren’t bidirectional and the neg should have to defend their norm since they have more time. Aff theory first – it’s a much larger strategic loss because 1min is ¼ of the 1AR vs 1/7 of the 1NC which means there’s more abuse if I’m devoting a larger fraction of time. May not be bidirectional because they are aff specific, if they read must read bidirectionally, drop them for exacerbating time skew which is lexically prior.

### Framework:

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being, or hedonistic act utilitarianism.

#### 1] Bindingness -- if I put my hand on a hot stove I’d automatically pull it back before a signal is sent to my brain -- proves Util is intrinsic to action

#### 2] Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations—takes out calc indicts since they are empirically denied.

#### 3] Extinction first:

#### A] Future lives -- trillions of future lives are lost. They are just as valuable as current ones – anything else says some lives are worth less than others which is a slippery slope to genocide.

#### B] Reversibility -- extinction forecloses future improvement; prefer -- if we’re unsure about which interpretation of the world is true, we should preserve it to figure things out.

#### 4] Practices are assumed to exist for the purposes of discussion. However, denying the assumptions behind statements just proves them valid. The only time the statement is invalid is when the consequent is false.

**Stanford** <https://web.stanford.edu/~bobonich/dictionary/dictionary.html>

Abbreviated Dictionary of Philosophical Terminology An introduction to philosophy Stanford University //Massa

[In a] Conditional statement: an “if p, then q” compound statement (ex. If I throw this ball into the air, it will come down); p is called the antecedent [condition], and q is the consequent. **A conditional asserts that if its antecedent is true, its consequent is also true**; **any** conditional **[statement] with a true [condition] antecedent and a false consequent must be false.** **For** any other combination of true and **false [conditions]** antecedents and consequents, **the** conditional **statement is true.**

### Underview

#### 1. Fairness first on theory layer a) every argument concedes the importance of fairness since you assume arguments would be evaluated fairly b) fairness isn’t just debater vs debater – unfairness means the judge can hack against scholarships c) many debaters would quit if the game was unfair which guts inclusion.

#### 2. Reject neg fairness a) 13-7-time skew and 6-minute collapse means I split time b) They can uplayer and restart the round to have time to generate offense that matters. c) They have access to more positions due to generic backfiles and bidirectional shells which means neg theory is impossible to avoid. They may not read theory heg – a) violates Overview answers b) every arg concedes authority, so hack and autovote aff if they do read it c) no brightline for what theory is

#### 3. All neg interps are counter interps since the aff takes an implicit stance on every issue which means you need an rvi to become offensive. You should accept all aff interps and assume I meet neg theory since the aff speaks in the dark and I have to take a stance on something, you can at least react and adapt. I don’t have to take a stance on anything in cross – a) judges don’t flow it b) let’s the 2NR go all in on something I wasn’t prepared for

#### 4. RVI on NC theory – you can read arguments such as T that are exclusively neg so I need them to compensate. Evaluate the debate after the 1AC – key to rectifying side bias. Responses presume the debate hasn’t already been evaluated in the 1AC.

#### 5. The neg may only link offense under an aff paradigm a) makes sure we have a reciprocal number of routes b) shifting in the nc nullifies 6 mins of the aff and the 1ar is too short to restart c) They have 13 mins of rebuttal time while I have 7, the aff framework compensates

#### 6. If I win one layer, vote aff a) they have 7 minutes to uplayer and nullify my offense b) forces engagement with the aff since they have to defend all arguments which means they read better ones.

#### 7. Allow new 2ar responses to nc arguments but not new 2n responses a) reciprocity - the NC has 7 minutes of rebuttal time while I only have 4 minutes, the 2ar makes it 7-7. b) Time skew – the 2n can overload the aff with args and makes the 2a impossible – allows for the neg to auto-win every round

**8. Neg may not run combo shells A) infinite number of theory violations makes engagement impossible B) they can always add another interp to skew me out of the round c) one shell per violation solves all their offense**

**9) Negative debaters may not read skepticism or arguments that trigger permissibility – a) plays an impossible aff burden, since there’s infinite ways to trigger b) skews the aff to defend examples like eating c) it’s illogical – winning framework disproves it**

**10) Refer to me in theory violation as Kelvin – anything else justifies misnaming and destroys predictability since I don’t know what they refer to**

**11)** **Theory or K indicts on spikes is drop the arg, my theory paradigms are simply presented models for debate.**