## Shell

#### [A] Interpretation: Debaters may not read frameworks with both normative and theoretical justifications. To clarify, theoretical justifications link back to fairness and education.

#### [B] Violation: They read TJF’s and normative justifications.

#### [C] Standards:

#### [1] Philosophical education—when I read a normatively justified framework in opposition, we are able to interact and weigh between two frameworks. However, when you include normative and theoretical justifications, you moot any philosophical education by a) extending pre-fiat reasons to come before substance b) require people to justify their framework substantively less and c) hone theory skills rather than reading literature. Kills philosophical education because we don’t engage on a substantive discussion of warrants. Philosophical education outweighs other links to education because LD is uniquely a values debate. Also controls the internal link to real world education because people make a bunch of moral decisions in their everyday lives.

#### [2] Strategy Skew—by having both layers, you can just collapse to whichever one I undercover in the next speech, skewing my strategy. Even if I put defense on theoretical justifications, you still win the framework debate. Strat skew is an independent voter because we need a coherent strategy to debate in the first place, meaning it precludes things like fairness or education.

#### Voters – Fairness is a voter since debate is a competitive activity that requires an equal shot at winning. Inclusion is a voter since it’s a pre-requisite to engagement in the space and the judge has an obligation as an educator to ensure a safe space. Resolvability is a voter since anything else maximizes the probability of judge intervention which minimizes the ballot as a determiner of the better debater which is its constitutive purpose.

#### DD – a) to deter future abuse,

#### CI – a) reasonability requires judge intervention because I don’t know where your BS meter is,

#### No RVIs – a) It’s illogical to vote for you for being fair, rounds without theory would be irresolvable b) It incentivizes you to bait theory and win off a scripted CI.

## Shell

#### Interpretation: If debaters defend a Kantian ethic, they must delineate which branch or subbranch of Kantianism they endorse in explicit text in the 1AC

#### There are several distinct ones

**Vleeschauwer 16**[Herman Jean de Vleeschauwer- Emeritus Professor of Philosophy “Kantianism” Encyclopædia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Kantianism#ref27103> March 2016] UT AI

* Epistemological Kantianism: those that conceive of the critical philosophy as an epistemology or a pure theory of (scientific) knowledge and methodology
  + Empirical Kantianism: Rooted in physiological or psychological inquiries
  + Logistic Kantianism: Stresses essences and the use of logic
* Metaphysical Kantianism: Rely on inductive metaphysics to make conclusions about the world in accordance with sciences
* Axiological Kantianism: concerned with value theory, branched, first, into an axiological approach which interpreted the methods of all three of Kant’s Critiques
  + Relativistic Kantianism: regarded the critical philosophy as a system of thought dependent upon social, cultural, and historical conditions

The critical philosophy has been subjected to **a variety of approaches** and methods of interpretation. These can be reduced to three fundamental types: those that conceive of the critical philosophy as an epistemology or a pure theory of (scientific) knowledge and methodology, those that conceive of it as a critical theory of metaphysics or the nature of being (ultimate reality), and those that conceive of it as a theory of normative or valuational reflection parallel to that of ethics (in the field of action). Each of these types—known, respectively, as **epistemological, metaphysical, and axiological Kantianism**—can, in turn, be subdivided into several secondary approaches. Historically, epistemological Kantianism included such different attitudes as **empirical Kantianism**, rooted either in physiological or psychological inquiries; the **logistic Kantianism** of the Marburg school, which stressed essences and the use of logic; and the realistic Kantianism of the Austrian Alois Riehl. Metaphysical Kantianism developed from the transcendental idealism of German Romanticism to realism, a course followed by many speculative thinkers, who saw in the critical philosophy the foundations of an essentially inductive metaphysics, in accordance with the results of the modern sciences. Axiological Kantianism, concerned with value theory, branched, first, into an axiological approach (properly so-called), which interpreted the methods of all three of Kant’s Critiques—Critik der reinen Vernunft (1781, rev. ed. 1787; Critique of Pure Reason), Critik der practischen Vernunft (1788; Critique of Practical Reason), and Critik der Urteilskraft (1790; Critique of Judgment)—as normative disciplines of thought, and, second, into an eclectic or **relativistic Kantianism**, which regarded the critical philosophy as a system of thought dependent upon social, cultural, and historical conditions. The chief representatives of these submovements are identified in the historical sections below.

**Violation: They don’t**

**Standards**

**1] Shiftiness-They can shift out of my turns based on whatever theory of the good they operate under due to the nature of a vague standard. Especially true because the warrants for their standard could justify different versions of Kantianism coming first and I wouldn’t know until the 1ar which gives them access to multiple contingent standards. CX can’t resolve this impact and is independently bad because A] Not flowed B] skews 6 min of prep during the aff because we don’t know what offense applies until after the ac is read C] They can proactively lie and there’s no way to check D] debaters can be intentionally shady.**

**2] Real World- Philosophers need to be as specific as possible when delineating their theory since there are so many nuances and contextual applications of philosophy that require us to understand the core differences within the philosophy. That outweighs since debate has no pedagogical value without portable application.**

**This spec shell isn’t regressive- it literally determines what framework the affirmative defends and how to link offense back to it**

## NC

#### I value Morality. Volition, or the structure of the will, is a pre-condition for ethics and has intrinsic value – A) Proceduralism – the will is the mechanism by which every agent engages in any activity, which means regardless of the content of any ethical theory, the ability to will that theory is an intrinsic good B) Foundations – the will is the basis for what constitutes an ethical subject which means its relation to the world is the primary ethical consideration C) Motivation – the structure of the will is the primary source of all our desires, reasons, and beliefs since it generates what counts as motivational to the subject D) Identity – the nature of the will is most constitutive to the creation of the subject since it determines what each subject considers intrinsic to its identity and what exists externally as an façade.

#### The will operates materially – individuals exercise their agency in the world, as ideas and actions clash against one another. This takes place through a dialectical process that unfolds in three stages: First, a thesis is introduced by action or reason – for example a group of workers exercises their intention to strike against poor working conditions. Second, an antithesis is produced in response by the agent acted against – the corporation. The exercise of these opposing wills terminates in a synthesis – a conclusion that terminates in a mix of the thesis and antithesis – like a contractual agreement that re-negotiates labor conditions. This view of the will has 3 benefits: First, it prevents a contradiction of wills from generating a contradiction – it allows a process of iterative testing by which the negation of an idea does not terminate the process of truth making, but furthers it by addition of new information. Second, it ensures that epistemological starting points do not have to appear from nowhere, since thought is a continuous flow of ideas rather than a negation of an idea that requires a spontaneous creation of a new one. Third, the material approach ensures that A) we have a verifiable way of deciphering the conflict between multiple wills and B) non-material starting points always necessarily materialize themselves in action, which requires a material analysis to understand the effectiveness of any immaterial approach. This culminates in the act of appropriation – the ability to view yourself as a practical agent capable of taking up a project that actively changes your own subject and the role itself.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with dialectical appropriation.

**Prefer on Action theory – Only viewing an agent as an active body capable of generating intentions can hold agents culpable and decipher the difference between actions and wishes. That’s a necessary feature of ethics since we must be able to warrant a coherent conception of what motivates our actions in order to provide a method to actually implement ethical principles.**

#### I contend that the appropriation of outer space is not unjust.

#### 1. A) Appropriation is what produces meaning. mixing our will with the cosmos is what allows us to ground ourselves as subjects. B) Fixation – Preventing space exploration artificially limits the possibility of human experience, which alienates us from our potential and from the world that exists beyond the arbitrary limits of our atmosphere C) Increases our connection to nature

**3. Epistemology – Ideas are generated through material action and confrontation – that requires an exploration of an idea in order to create a thesis and begin the epistemological process of ethics creation. This requires us to appropriate space since only the act of appropriation can begin the process of understanding and making a judgement of it as an externality.**

**4. Private property is key to recognizing agents through the personality in their work. Recognition is necessary for agents to be non-alienated bc we need to establish relations with the world.**

**Hughes 98 -** "The Philosophy of Intellectual Property," 77 Georgetown L.J. 287, 330-350 (1988) by Justin Hughes [https://cyber.harvard.edu/IPCoop/88hugh2.html] // ahs emi

At first blush, this economic rationale seems far removed from the concerns of personality theory, [n244](https://cyber.harvard.edu/IPCoop/88hugh2.html#n244) yet it can be recast into the framework of the personality theory. From the Hegelian perspective, payments from intellectual property users to the property creator are acts of recognition. These payments acknowledge the individual's claim over the property, and it is through such acknowledgement that an individual is recognized by others as a person. [n245](https://cyber.harvard.edu/IPCoop/88hugh2.html#n245) "Recognition" involves more than lip service. If I say "this forest is your property" and then proceed to flagrantly trespass, cut your timber, and hunt your deer, I have not recognized your property rights. Similarly, verbal recognition of an intellectual property claim is not equal to the recognition implicit in a payment. Purchasers of a copyrighted work or licensees of a patent form a circle of people recognizing the creator as a person. Furthermore, this generation of income complements the personality theory in as much as income facilitates further expression. When royalties from an invention allow the inventor to buy a grand piano he has always wanted, the transaction helps maximize personality. But this argument tends to be too broad. First, much income is used for basic necessities, leading to the vacuous position that life-sustenance is "personally maximizing" because it allows the personality to continue. Second, this approach could justify property rights for after-the-fact development of personality interests without requiring [\*350] such interests in the property at the time the property rights are granted. The personality theory provides a better, more direct justification for the alienation of intellectual property, especially copies. The alienation of copies is perhaps the most rational way to gain exposure for one's ideas. This is a non-economic, and perhaps higher, form of the idea of recognition: respect, honor, and admiration. Even for starving artists recognition of this sort may be far more valuable than economic rewards. Two conditions appear essential, however, to this justification of alienation: first, the creator of the work must receive public identification, and, second, the work must receive protection against any changes unintended or unapproved by the creator.VARA Hegel's prohibition of "complete" alienation of intellectual property appears to result from his recognition of the necessity for these two conditions. While he would permit alienation of copies, and even the rights to further reproduction, [n246](https://cyber.harvard.edu/IPCoop/88hugh2.html#n246) he disapproves alienation of "those goods, or rather substantive characteristics, which constitute . . . private personality and the universal essence of . . . self-consciousness." [n247](https://cyber.harvard.edu/IPCoop/88hugh2.html#n247) Such alienation necessarily occurs if the recognition of the connection between a creator and his expression is destroyed or distorted. When the first condition is violated, this recognition is destroyed; when the second condition is violated, it is distorted.

## Shell

#### Interp: The affirmative debater may not claim that each affirmation is a possibility of negating. To clarify, indexicals is bad.

#### Violation – the impact calc b point

#### Negate:

#### ~1~ infinite abuse – there are infinite potential indexes that could affirm including descriptive standards that are impossible to turn and allowing them to win if they affirm under any index makes it impossible to negate – they can introduce a new descriptive index in the 1ar and auto-win which means it’s impossible to beat them. strongest internal link to fairness since one side wins every round.

#### ~2~ accessibility – indexicals justifies horrible things, i.e. if the resolution was "slavery ought to be reinstated," under a certain index, that would affirm such as "consistency with reinstating slavery,"

## Case

### OV

### Framing

### Kant negates