1NC

T Generic – States

Interpretation: "states" is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend a subset of states eliminating nuclear arsenals.

The upward entailment test and adverb test determine the genericity of a bare plural

<u>**Leslie and Lerner 16**</u> [Sarah-Jane Leslie, Ph.D., Princeton, 2007. Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. Served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University. Adam Lerner, PhD Philosophy, Postgraduate Research Associate, Princeton 2018. From 2018, Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow in the Center for Bioethics at New York University. Member of the Princeton Social Neuroscience Lab.] "Generic Generalizations." Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. April 24, 2016. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/ TG

1. Generics and Logical Form

In English, **generics can be expressed using** a variety of syntactic forms: **bare plurals (e.g., "tigers are striped"), indefinite singulars (e.g., "a tiger is striped"), and definite singulars ("the tiger is striped"). However, none of these syntactic forms is dedicated to expressing generic claims; each can also be used to express existential and/or specific claims**. Further, some **generics express** what appear to be **generalizations over individuals (e.g., "tigers are striped")**, while others appear to predicate properties directly of the kind (e.g., "dodos are extinct"). These facts and others give rise to a number of questions concerning the logical forms of generic statements.

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in (1b), some individual tiger in (2b), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in (3b)—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.

The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with "some" with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology "existential reading". The application of the term "existential interpretation" is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a kind.

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**. Consider our examples above. In (1b), we can replace "tiger" with "animal" salva veritate, but in (1a) we cannot. **If "tigers are on the lawn" is**

true, then "animals are on the lawn" must be true. However, "tigers are striped" is true, yet "animals are striped" is false. (1a) does not entail that animals are striped, but (1b) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

==**Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning**== (Krifka et al. 1995). **For example, inserting "usually" in the sentences in (1a) (e.g., "tigers are usually striped") produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting "usually" in (1b) 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" to mark off the generic reading.)

It applies to "states" – 1] upward entailment test – "states ought to eliminate nukes" doesn't entail that "political bodies ought to eliminate nukes" cuz it doesn't prove that ISIS or the UN should eliminate nukes, 2] adverb test – adding "usually" to the res doesn't substantially change its meaning because elimination is universal and permanent

Violation – they only defend _____

Vote neg:
1] Limits – you can pick anything from Israel to India to North Korea and there's no universal DA since each state has different geopolitics and nukes – it explodes neg prep and leads to random state of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible – limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep
2] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff. PICs don't solve – it's absurd to say neg potential abuse justifies the aff being flat out not T, which leads to a race towards abuse.

2NR States

2NR Limits

O/V

Our interpretation is that the aff should defend that all states should eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

Limits o/w their pragmatic offense – preserving a vision of the topic that maximizes clash and equitable debate for the negative should be the nexus question of your decision. The only unique benefit to the activity is the neg's ability to rigorously contest the claims of the aff. Every other impact: topic education, aff ground, and innovation are all secondary to the ability to preserve a reasonable expectation of neg prep by accepting a hard cap on the number of affs. Winning a small risk of a link to the limits disad is sufficient to vote negative because it makes debate fundamentally unfair.

1] They kill limits – there are 511 affs which is compounded because affs can defend broad arsenal definitions like uranium enrichment facilities which explodes nuclear states and makes neg prep impossible by encouraging small one and done affs – today it's Israeli uranium reactors, tomorrow is French and Russian ICBMs, and Monday is India's Agni 5 missiles. Each state has very different geopolitical issues which means affs always have more specific ev on core disads like deterrence. Our interp is better – they can defend different nukes which is a good middle ground because there's only so many nukes that have an impact or are relevant in the lit.

2] Err neg – the topic is huge – single states aren't key for good aff innovation which is proven by Durham Academy's submarines aff or the ICBMs advantage but it wrecks neg prep cuz we lose generic disads and there's no unifying process counterplans or politics disads across different countries. This flips reasonability cuz its try or die for a balanced version of the topic.

3] TVA solves all their educational offense—reading [their states] as an advantage allows for their education but also forces the aff to strategically select their plan and advantages to respond to PICs. They still get to specify nukes to narrow the debate.

AT 9 Affs

1] They're wrong about 9 affs

A] There are 511 affs cuz u get any combo of countries – combinations are key since the require different case negs i.e. a disad about how Indian nukes deter Pakistani first strike doesn't apply if the aff gets rid of Indian and Pakistani nukes

B] Affs can read broad definitions of "nuclear arsenals" i.e. uranium enrichment capabilities explodes affs to every country with nuclear power capabilities which includes Brazil, Argentina, Japan, Germany and more

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Enriched_uranium#Global_enrichment_facilities

2] 9 affs still links to our offense

A] Each aff requires in-depth research cuz nuclear policy is complicated and requires an understanding of regional actors or historical tensions

B] Topic lit is in the context of global disarm not just one state – nobody talks about Noko disarm because it's super unrealistic that just Noko eliminates their nukes – that means even if nine affs isn't generally unreasonable, it is on this topic cuz literature is skewed

AT Clash/T Lit

1] TVA solves – you still get the specific education of country advantages i.e. the IndoPak advantage on the Harker aff or the Russia and Pakistan advantages on the Durham submarines aff and global disarm has a huge lit base with asymmetry, prolif, miscalc, cyberterror, and more

2] Prefer limited topics- they encourage large affirmatives like the global disarmament aff that have deep literature bases

3] Limits o/w

A] It hijacks internal link – debates are only educational if both debaters engage – a massive prep skew means the negative always has an incentive to uplayer and never engage which non-uniques their impact and proves the interp is better

B] Reversibility – you can get educational debates on other parts of the flow or from out of round, but the neg strat is not reversible since we get no basis to respond.

AT PICs

1] PICs is wrong on this topic – <u>this argument ends the debate and proves no disads to TVA</u>.

A] Affs like Harrison's nuclear colonialism or Mitty and Harker's global disarm affs have all nukes key warrants i.e. nuclear asymmetry upsets stability, leaves nukes vulnerable to theft or hackers, or perpetuates colonialism.

B] PICs out of combinations of countries don't exist – nobody reads the IndoPak PIC but they do read the IndoPak aff which means the aff prep burden of PICs is 9 but the neg prep burden for affs is 511 so our limits offense o/w on magnitude

2] Turn – when the neg has no specific prep they're incentivized to rely on silly backfile word pics, or random open evidence process pics that moot the 1AC and destroy core topic ed

3] 1AR theory checks PICs—if they're so abusive you should be able to win the theory debate.

4] Research burden: affs only need a couple permutations, analytic solvency deficits or cards, and defense to the net benefit to answer pics, whereas the neg needs a full 7 minute case neg vs affs, which means our internal link outweighs on magnitude

5] Potential neg abuse doesn't justify aff abuse—it would justify infinite aff abuse where affs read 40 a prioris because the neg could read 50 condo pics

6] Limits outweighs on probability – people don't read PICs that often under nebel but people read a hyperspec aff every time under their interp – size of link determines size of impact so even if they're winning PICs are way worse than plans, it's not frequent enough to make up the link differential

7] The abuse is inevitable – it stems from forcing a 1AR restart, but any strategic neg does that regardless with things like a K.

8] Turn – forces better education since you learn to defend your aff vs specific PICs and that occurs thru deep research and strategic thinking

9] Quality of ground – I'll just be reading bad args that barely link which means you can just answer them – proves that your underlimiting of affs kills good ground

10] Neg ground – the aff has infinite prep to craft an AC with strategic angles against PICs like perception advantages, perms, etc. and can always straight turn the net benefit, but the neg is inherently reactive so the skew is much harder when they have no ability to effectively prep the aff

AT Overlimiting

1] TVA solves – you could have read your aff with [their nukes] as the advantage – we don't prohibit you from new advantages, frameworks, or mechanisms – the aff can innovate with new arguments rather than new plans making sure the negative is never caught unprepared which better encourages clash and research cuz it provides topic stability

2] Non-UQ – you still have research incentive to look for the best advantages under our interp for strength of link on the link debate – there's always a race to the top to find answers to scenarios teams read.

3] Prep burdens are reciprocal – we prep all potential advantages, you prep all potential disads.

4] Turn – overlimiting is better – stale engagement is better than no engagement at all

AT Functional Limits

Framing issue: they have no examples of generics that apply to all countries and no explanation of what functional limits check our caselist – people read affs without solvency advocates all the time and nothing stops them reading a Kant framework and slapping a France submarines plan on it.

1] Doesn't check—you can find solvency advocates for basically any state because of random bloggers

2] Doesn't solve reciprocal prep burdens—it's way easier for the aff to prep specific answers to a generic but much harder for the neg to have specifics to an aff. Any generic argument is destroyed by "they don't have a piece of evidence specific to our aff".

3] Turn – this leads to an awful prep disparity since the aff has infinite prep against a finite number of generics so the neg always loses since they know what they'll debate but we don't know what specific aff they'll read.

4] Err neg—this is LD not policy—we only have the topic for a few months—in-depth research on a litany of affirmatives isn't possible in that short of a timespan which means they result in overstretched negs and "random state of the week affs" that the neg is never able to keep up with and prioritizes silly new affs that don't link to anything with no educational advantage to debating core controversies.

---Generics

1] Turn – this leads to an awful prep disparity since the aff has infinite prep against a finite number of generics so the neg always loses since they know what they'll debate but we don't know what specific aff they'll read.

2] Doesn't assume debate – the value of debate comes from rigorously testing each other's positions based on well-researched and developed arguments which generics don't allow for – my interp allows neg engagement and generics

3] Irreciprocal – you can prep specific answers to a generic based on your aff but I can't have specific turns to your aff

4] Non UQ – under our interp negs still need to apply generics to specific advantages by doing impact comparison and turns case analysis

---Solvency Advocate

1] Solvency advocates don't check – there are thousands of solvency advocates relating how specific nukes need to be eliminated, but few are in the context of single states which means our interp creates a good middle ground.

2] No b/l – anybody can be a solvency advocate – do they have to be published or just a blogger – there's no way for negs to know what counts or not, so they still can't prep

3] The ci doesn't mandate that people have solvency advocates, just that they can spec, which means this isn't offense for them since their model means people can choose not to

---Disclosure Solves

1] No solvency – there's only 30 minutes of preround prep that we had to cut answers to the aff while you've had months to prep – that creates a massive advantage for the aff who's already ahead which makes being neg impossible.

2] Disclosing a non-topical position doesn't change how topical it is. It may be disclosed but it's still unfair and outside your jurisdiction to vote on. That's like saying you can read an aff on the free speech topic because it's disclosed.

3] The ci doesn't mandate that people disclose, just that they can spec, which means this isn't offense for them since their model means people can choose not to

4] Link defense: people break new affs all the time so it's inefficient to spend my time before the tournament prepping out already broken plans.

5] It's a question of the caselist you justify because I have to prep answers to all of them – if one million affs are on the wiki, there's no way to prep them all

6] Not everybody knows what the wiki is – excludes new debaters or people from small schools

AT Limits Arb

1] No link – we justify our limit in the context of lit reviews and other accredited sources.

2] Debatability outweighs—arbitrariness only has an impact insofar as it occludes debate but our limits offense proves the opposite—you should preserve the ability of the negative to rigorously contest the affirmative because it's where debate's education comes from.

3] No impact – this is the fallacy of Loki's Wager – we follow arbitrary things all the time – we don't know when red becomes orange but can obviously pick a color and say it's red or orange

4] Non-unique – all theory standards beg the question of quantifiability, but we can still weigh strength of link.

5] No impact – it assumes a higher level notion that args are ex post facto arbitrary when in the context of debate they just need justification.

AT Too Many DA's

1] Its reciprocal – the aff has to prep every disad but neg has to prep every advantage

2] You can always put smart analytics on the DA and go for case outweighs and that's better because you can still weigh the case – I literally can't generate offense because you'd just delink the DA

3] You get infinite prep for your aff—you should have answers to each disad or at least be able to outweigh them—write a more strategic advantage

4] We at least get some debate under our interp—there's 1NC engagement—the aff results in no engagement post-1AC, so there's still the opportunity for quantitatively more clash