**A is the interpretation:** The affirmative debater may only generate offense from member nations of the WTO reducing intellectual property protections, they may not read extra topical planks

**B is the violation: : Violation**

**Their Lindsey 21 card advocates for an extratopical plank to the plan - direct government payments to companies. The card does not say that direct support *will result* from IP restrictiosn, but advocates that it *should happen* IN ADDITION to IP restrictions as a way to solve the innovation DA — this is literally how the card is tagged**

**"pharmaceutical industry has no legitimate basis for objecting to a TRIPS waiver. Since, because**

**of the public health crisis, drug makers now qualify for the superior benefits of direct**

**government support,". They conceded this in CX too**

1. Limits

They explode aff ground because there are an infinite amount of affs that could spec something extra topical as an infinite amount of things exist outside the topic. Multiple Impacts **a)** **Strat skew**, pigeonholes the neg into generics because they can just cherry-pick aff’s with trivially true offense **b) Prep skew,** an infinite number of aff’s meansI don’t have time to prep destroying negative engagement **c) Qualitative and Quantitative ground,** trying to incorporate something into their aff they can’t possibly achieve or shifting the debate away from testing requires specific CPs/DAs which ignores large swathes of topic lit. My counterplan would have been theLindsey card advocates: have governments pump resources into private companies so that they have incentive to produce the medicines and they are still available to everyone. Competition for the CP derives from the fact that *only* reducing IP protections kills innovation. If the aff can additionally advocate a separate policy to pump state resources into private companies, they are just hijacking neg ground.

1. TVA solves all abuse; they can just read their case without the lindsey evidence, or advocating for direct government funding.

**This links to fairness because the neg has to be able to conceptualize neg ground and if the aff can advocate extratopical planks then they can fiat their way out of any neg arguments; the fact that this argument kills this specific innovation DA and government funding CP proves the abuse.**

**D are the Voters**

**Fairness** is a voter because debate is a contest to find the better debater, and we can’t do this if one debater arbitrarily skews the round; that just finds the better cheater.

Fairness double bind, either fairness doesn’t matter and you hack against my opponent arbitrarily or fairness does matter and you vote.

*Drop the debater*

1. To deter future abuse
2. DTA is severance because I’m indicting their whole

Don’t give the them an RVI

1. You shouldn’t win if you are being fair, it’s your burden
2. Chilling effect Nobody will run theory against good theory debaters for fear of losing on theory- this is the biggest impact because then theory just doesn’t work and lose to stupid tricks
3. Reciprocity means that they can run theory on me, not that they get an RVI

Prefer competing interps

1. Rz creates race to the bottom