### T

#### Interpretation: the affirmative debater must not specify a government or subset of governments.

#### The article “a” implies a nonspecific or generic reading of the word “government”.

Walden 16Grammar: Articles, Walden University, Feb 8, 2016 <https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/writingcenter/grammar/articles>

What is an article? Articles ("a," "an," and "the") are determiners or noun markers that function to specify if the noun is general or specific in its reference. Often the article chosen depends on if the writer and the reader understand the reference of the noun. The articles "a" and "an" are indefinite articles. They are used with a singular countable noun when the noun referred to is nonspecific or generic. The article "the" is a definite article. It is used to show specific reference and can be used with both singular and plural nouns and with both countable and uncountable nouns. Many languages do not use articles ("a," "an," and "the"), or if they do exist, the way they are used may be different than in English.

#### “Just government” is a generic indefinite singular.

Leslie 12 Leslie, Sarah-Jane. “Generics.” In Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Language, edited by Gillian Russell and Delia Fara, 355–366. Routledge, 2012. [https://www.princeton.edu/~sjleslie/RoutledgeHandbookEntryGenerics.pdf SM //](https://www.princeton.edu/~sjleslie/RoutledgeHandbookEntryGenerics.pdf%20SM%20//)recut SHS KS

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

#### This applies to the res – 1] Upward entailment test – “a just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike” doesn’t imply that “a just society ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike” 2] Adverb test -- “usually a just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike” doesn’t substantially change the meaning of the res

#### Violation – they only defend \_\_\_ . I Inserted a list of governments here and their types.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\_of\_forms\_of\_government

Vote neg—

#### 1] Precision o/w – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Limits – the topic is too big to count – every government from West Virginia’s state gov to China – unlimited topics incentivize obscure affs that negs won’t have prep on – limits are key to reciprocal prep burden – PICs is wrong – exceptions don’t disprove a generic statement.

#### 3] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff.

#### 

#### Fairness is a voter debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it.

#### Reject potential abuse -- it’s absurd to say neg potential abuse justifies the aff being flat out not T, which leads to a race towards abuse.

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

#### Comes before 1AR theory -- A] If we had to be abusive it’s because it was impossible to engage their aff B] T outweighs on scope because their abuse affected every speech that came after the 1AC C] Topic norms outweigh on urgency – we only have a few months to set them

## Case

What Is china?

Library of Congress 2006 <https://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/cs/profiles/China.pdf>

Formal Name: People's Republic of China

#### Plan text generic –

### Framework

#### Permissibility negates - Lack of obligation proves the resolution false - the res specifically says you have to prove obligation, you cannot be obligated and lack an obligation simultaneously - Outweighs their warrants based on textuality, which comes first because the only thing we have access to before the round is the text of the resolution itself

**Presume neg - A. We assume statements to be false until proven true. That is why we don’t believe in alternate realities or conspiracy theories. The lack of a reason something is false does not me it is assumed to be true. B. Statements are more often false then true. If I say this pen is red, I can only prove it true in one way by demonstrating that it is indeed red, where I can prove it false in an infinite amount of ways.**

### Long---Co2 Ag

#### Climate change is key to food security, solve water scarcity, economic growth, and increased trade

Lamar Smith 17, B.A. in American Studies from Yale University, J.D. from Southern Methodist University, a business and financial writer for the CSM, “Don’t Believe the Hysteria Over Carbon Dioxide”, https://www.dailysignal.com/2017/07/24/dont-believe-hysteria-carbon-dioxide/

The benefits of a changing climate are often ignored and under-researched. Our climate is too complex and the consequences of misguided policies too harsh to discount the positive effects of carbon enrichment. A higher concentration of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere would aid photosynthesis, which in turn contributes to increased plant growth. This correlates to a greater volume of food production and better quality food. Studies indicate that crops would utilize water more efficiently, requiring less water. And colder areas along the farm belt will experience longer growing seasons. While crops typically suffer from high heat and lack of rainfall, carbon enrichment helps produce more resilient food crops, such as maize, soybeans, wheat, and rice. In fact, atmospheric carbon dioxide is so important for plant health that greenhouses often use a carbon dioxide generator to increase production. Besides food production, another benefit of increased carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is the lush vegetation that results. The world’s vegetated areas are becoming 25-50 percent greener, according to satellite images. Seventy percent of this greening is due to a rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide. Greater vegetation assists in controlling water runoff, provides more habitats for many animal species, and even aids in climate stabilization, as more vegetation absorbs more carbon dioxide. When plant diversity increases, these vegetated areas can better eliminate carbon from the atmosphere. Also, as the Earth warms, we are seeing beneficial changes to the earth’s geography. For instance, Arctic sea ice is decreasing. This development will create new commercial shipping lanes that provide faster, more convenient, and less costly routes between ports in Asia, Europe, and eastern North America. This will increase international trade and strengthen the world economy. Fossil fuels have helped raise the standard of living for billions of people. Furthermore, research has shown that regions that have enjoyed a major reduction in poverty achieved these gains by expanding the use of fossil fuels for energy sources. For nations to progress, they need access to affordable energy. Fossil fuels provide the energy necessary to develop affordable food, safe drinking water, and reliable housing for those who have never had it before. Studies indicate that in the U.S. alone, the natural gas industry is responsible for millions of jobs and has increased the wealth of Americans by an average of $1,337. Economic growth as well as greater food production and increased vegetation are just some of the benefits that can result from our changing climate.

#### Resource shortages cause nuclear war

FDI 12, Future Directions International, a Research institute providing strategic analysis of Australia’s global interests; citing Lindsay Falvery, PhD in Agricultural Science and former Professor at the University of Melbourne’s Institute of Land and Environment, “Food and Water Insecurity: International Conflict Triggers & Potential Conflict Points,” <http://www.futuredirections.org.au/workshop-papers/537-international-conflict-triggers-and-potential-conflict-points-resulting-from-food-and-water-insecurity.html>

There is a growing appreciation that the conflicts in the next century will most likely be fought over a lack of resources.¶ Yet, in a sense, this is not new. Researchers point to the French and Russian revolutions as conflicts induced by a lack of food. More recently, Germany’s World War Two efforts are said to have been inspired, at least in part, by its perceived need to gain access to more food. Yet the general sense among those that attended FDI’s recent workshops, was that the scale of the problem in the future could be significantly greater as a result of population pressures, changing weather, urbanisation, migration, loss of arable land and other farm inputs, and increased affluence in the developing world.¶ In his book, Small Farmers Secure Food, Lindsay Falvey, a participant in FDI’s March 2012 workshop on the issue of food and conflict, clearly expresses the problem and why countries across the globe are starting to take note. .¶ He writes (p.36), “…if people are hungry, especially in cities, the state is not stable – riots, violence, breakdown of law and order and migration result.”¶ “Hunger feeds anarchy.”¶ This view is also shared by Julian Cribb, who in his book, The Coming Famine, writes that if “large regions of the world run short of food, land or water in the decades that lie ahead, then wholesale, bloody wars are liable to follow.” ¶ He continues: “An increasingly credible scenario for World War 3 is not so much a confrontation of super powers and their allies, as a festering, self-perpetuating chain of resource conflicts.” He also says: “The wars of the 21st Century are less likely to be global conflicts with sharply defined sides and huge armies, than a scrappy mass of failed states, rebellions, civil strife, insurgencies, terrorism and genocides, sparked by bloody competition over dwindling resources.”¶ As another workshop participant put it, people do not go to war to kill; they go to war over resources, either to protect or to gain the resources for themselves.¶ Another observed that hunger results in passivity not conflict. Conflict is over resources, not because people are going hungry.¶ A study by the International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict. Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkans experienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon.¶ The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA, the US Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Oslo Peace Research Institute, all identify famine as a potential trigger for conflicts and possibly even nuclear war.

#### Food shortages cause war and go nuclear.

FDI 12 Future Directions International, a Research institute providing strategic analysis of Australia’s global interests; citing Lindsay Falvery, PhD in Agricultural Science and former Professor at the University of Melbourne’s Institute of Land and Environment, “Food and Water Insecurity: International Conflict Triggers & Potential Conflict Points,” http://www.futuredirections.org.au/workshop-papers/537-international-conflict-triggers-and-potential-conflict-points-resulting-from-food-and-water-insecurity.html

There is a growing appreciation thatthe conflicts in the next century willmost likelybe fought over a lack of resources. Yet, in a sense, this is not new. Researchers point to the French and Russian revolutions as conflicts induced by a lack of food**.** More recently, Germany’s World War Two efforts are said to have been inspired, at least in part, by its perceived need to gain access to more **food.** Yet the general sense among those that attended FDI’s recent workshops, was that **the scale of the problem in the future could be** significantly greateras a result of population pressures, changing weather, urbanisation, migration, loss of arable land and other farm inputs, and increased affluence in the developing world. In his book, Small Farmers Secure Food, Lindsay Falvey, a participant in FDI’s March 2012 workshop on the issue of food and conflict, clearly expresses the problem and why countries across the globe are starting to take note. .He writes (p.36), “…if people are hungry, especially in cities, the state is not stable – riots, violence, breakdown of law and order and migration result.”¶ “Hunger feeds anarchy.”¶ This view is also shared by Julian Cribb, who in his book, The Coming Famine, writes that if “large regions of the world run short of food, land or water in the decades that lie ahead, then wholesale, bloody wars are liable to follow.” He continues: “An increasingly credible scenario for World War 3 is not so much a confrontation of super powers and their allies, as afestering**,** self-perpetuatingchainof resource conflicts.” He also says: “The wars of the 21st Century are less likely to be global conflicts with sharply defined sides and huge armies, than a scrappy mass of failed states, rebellions, civil strife, insurgencies, terrorism and genocides, sparked by bloody competition over dwindling resources.”¶ As another workshop participant put it, people do not go to war to kill; they go to war over resources, either to protect or to gain the resources for themselves.¶ Another observed that hunger results in passivity not conflict. Conflict is over resources, not because people are going hungry.¶ A study by the International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict.Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkansexperienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon.¶ The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA, theUS Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Oslo Peace Research Institute, all identify famine as a potential trigger for conflicts and possibly even nuclear war

#### No extinction from warming

Seidov 14—Researcher at NOAA and PhD in Geophysics, Fluid Dynamics, and Thermodynamics [Dan, “Are you aware of any peer-reviewed paper that explicitly classifies current global climate change as an existential risk (risk of human extinction)?” Research Gate, 4 Nov 2014, http://tinyurl.com/jrnfafu, accessed 6 Sep 2016]

The current global climate change does not have a potential to cause human extinction. Past severe climate changes were critical for many ancient civilizations, yet our existence proofs that they were not potent enough to cause entire termination of the humankind. The projected changes, even in the worst case scenarios, can cause many dramatic local changes. For example, change in rainfall patterns in agricultural countries may lead to possible famine and other dramatic events. However, any imaginable climate changes based on modern climate science cannot generate existential risks for the entire human civilization. In my view, a paper predicting such a catastrophe in any foreseeable future, at least on the time scale of human civilization, that is, thousands of years, has no chance of being published in any serious research journal.

### Advantage 2

#### They only worse insurgent strikes – the aff slips status quo categorical control of China which Friedman isolates is the squo

#### Hong Kong and Xinxiang both prove no impact to repression.

#### State controls unions – zero shift towards them.

Zero IL for korea war – they need reverse causal ev that says china would collapse

No korea war – us disproves

No korea war – ev is about lucury goods