## Shell

**Interpretation: Debaters must specify a definition of “reduce” in a delineated text in the 1ac.**

**Violation: They don’t**

**No consistent definition of reduce**

**Word Hippo “What is another word for reduce”, [https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html] // Swickle**

To decrease in amount or degree To lower in length or size [To summarize](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-3) [To bring to an undesirable state](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-4) [To lower in volume](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-5) [To lower in rank](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-6) [To lower in price](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-7) (*cooking*) [To thicken a liquid through heating](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-8) (*of weight*) [To get rid of](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-9) [To financially cripple](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-10) [To forcibly impose obedience or servitude upon](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-11) [To decrease in strength or intensity](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-12) [To cause damage to, or have a diminishing effect on](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-13) [To cause to become physically weaker](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-14) [To compress, crush or squeeze something, altering its shape in the process](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-15) [To represent in a particular style](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-16) [To be economical or frugal with](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-17) [To separate or cause to be separated into constituent parts or components](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-18) [To make oneself thinner, especially by dieting](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-19) [Restrict oneself to small amounts or special kinds of food in order to lose weight](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-20) [To melt a substance, especially metal](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-21) [To prepare food for consumption, usually using heat](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-22) [To slow the growth or progress of, or to keep under control](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-23) [To eat (something) steadily and often audibly](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-24) [React or alter](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-25) [To undermine, especially someone's mood, ideas or feelings](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-26) [To separate or reduce into atoms](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-27) [Simplify (something) so much that a distorted impression of it is given](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-28) [To neutralize or cancel by exerting an opposite and equal force](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-29) [To become something different](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-30) [To bring disrepute to, especially through aspersions](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-31) [To render comprehensible or understandable](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-32) [To steal the limelight from](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-33) [Assess financial value](https://www.wordhippo.com/what-is/another-word-for/reduce.html#C0-34)

**Standards:**

**[1] Stable ground: If they don’t specify they can say perm do the cp against every advantage and process counterplan that reforms the system of IPR because it would count as a reduction – only spec ensures we don’t lose after the 1nc from affs shifting the goalposts. Normal means doesn’t solve bc they will contest it in the 1ar and change their strategy based on the 1nc.**

**[2] Shiftiness: they can redefine how the aff enacts the plan ie what reduce means in the 1ar which decks strategy and allows them to wriggle out of negative positions which strips the neg of any DA that is hedged on the reduction of ip which is basically every single DA.**

#### F

#### E

**CI – a) brightlines are arbitrary and self-serving which doesn’t set good norms b) it collapses since weighing between brightlines rely on offense defense**

**Neg theory is drop the debater – a) Prep skew – aff’s infinite prep means they can frontline every shell marginally enough to be efficient at DA and skew substance enough to deflate theory and win b) 1AR Flex – It’s key to check 1ar flexibility since you can moot all 6 min of my offense and restart the debate on unpredictable layers while kicking the arguments that were abusive.**

**No rvis**

**[a] Baiting—they’ll bait the theory debate and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse since they’ll get away with unacceptable practices every time.**

**[b] 1AR all-outs—they’ll collapse entirely to theory which crowds out substance and kills education.**

**[c] Chilling effect—people will be scared to read theory since they can lose off of it, so no one will check abuse.**

**[d] Norm-setting—I shouldn’t be forced to keep advocating for a bad norm if I realize it’s bad in the middle of the round. Then bad norms would be spread.**

**Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology and 1st and last speech 3] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.**

**1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier**

## Shell

**Interpretation – Debaters must only read framework warrants that prove the truth of their framework outside the context of debate.**

#### Violation – You read a performativity standard which appeals to the truth of your framework given the nature of debate “our ability to debate in this round is reliant on our ability to self-legislate…”

**Standards –**

**1] Strat Skew: A] It allows you to extend one argument to invalidate 99% of the framework debate because contesting your framework concedes its authority B] Performativity creates a reducto-ad-absurdum where if I respond to it, you will just say that I relied your framework to respond to it creating a paradox. That makes the framework debate unwinnable and irresolvable. Resolvability is an independent voter since any increase in irresolvability maximizes the probability of judge intervention which prevents a true test of the better debater.**

**NC**

**The standard is consistency with the standpoint of the skeptic.**

**Prefer –**

**1. TJFs – A) Ground – It’s the only standard that has equal quality and quantity ground on both sides since if another framework is normative it would prescribe an absolute correct obligation to do either the aff or neg, but skep allows debaters to make arguments without a truth quality to them which means its purely a test of skill B) Phil ed – All moral frameworks begin from the question of how to resolve skepticism which means it controls the internal link to all other framework education C) Real-world – Interrogating the internal warrants of every arguments’ foundation is key to developing advocacy skills for responding to everyone who disagrees by being able to answer all their objections**

**2. Holding ourselves to a standard of absolute truth is necessary: A) Culpability – Truth is the standard to which we hold people accountable for their actions, absent an understanding of the way the world actually is, people could make up their own understandings which makes it impossible for us to every justify why something someone did was bad, incorrect, etc and tell them to change B) Outcomes – The truth of the world is the ultimate determiner of the success of our actions, for example, if we were to act as though climate change wasn’t real because it is convenient, we would die of climate change must faster C) Resolvability – Debate requires a maintenance of truth – if debaters could make arguments like affirm because 2+2=5 debate as a concept would become incoherent since there’s no metric to determine who is winning based on the truth of their claims.**

**Skeptics would argue:**

**1. Moral Skep: Justice requires us to act immediately since waiting in the face of injustice is itself an injustice. However, we need to be fully informed to avoid formulating a rule incorrectly and unjustly, so obligations are internally contradictory. Jacques Derrida 92 - Derrida, Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice, October 10, 1992** “The Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority” Accessed 3/11/19

But **justice,** however unpresentable it may be, doesn't wait.· It is that which **must not wait.** To be direct, simple and brief, let us say this: **a just decision is always required immediately, "right away." It cannot furnish itself with** infinite information and the **unlimited knowledge of conditions,** rules or hypothetical imperatives **that could justify it.** And **even if it did** have all that at its disposal, even if it did give itself the time, all the time and all the necessary facts about the matter, **the moment of decision,** as such, **always remains a finite moment of urgency** and precipitation, since it must not be the consequence or the effectof this theoretical or historical knowledge, of this reflection or this deliberation, **since it always marks the interruption of the** juridico- or ethico- or politico-**cognitive deliberation that precedes it,** that must precede it. The instant of decision is a madness, says Kierkegaard. This is particularly true of the instant of the just decision that must rend time and defy dialectics. It is a madness. **Even if time** and prudence,the patience of knowledge and the mastery of conditions **were** hypothetically **unlimited, the decision would be structurally finite,** however late it came, decision of urgency and precipitation, **acting in** the night of **non-knowledge and non-rule.**

**And, any account of morality is regressive since it predicates one universal rule on the existence of another moral rule. Since every human chain of reasoning must be finite according to our finite nature, such a reasoning process must terminate in a rule for which no reason can be given.**

**2. External World Skep: No amount of subjective evidence can ever prove objective knowledge.**

**Searle 98 - John R Searle, Mind, Language and Society: Philosophy In The Real World, December 15, 1998** Accessed 3/11/19

**[Y]ou could have the best possible evidence about some domain and** still be radically **mistaken**. You could have the best possible evidence about other people’s behavior and still be mistaken about their mental states. You could have the best possible evidence about the past and still be mistaken about the future. You could have the best possible evidence aboutyour own perceptualexperiences and still be mistaken about the external world. This is so **because you could be dreaming, having hallucinations**, be a brain in a vat, **or** be **deceieved** systematically by an evil demon.Strange situations, yes, but **it is impossible to disprove the potentiality for** any of **these scenarios.**

**That negates since providing an obligation requires that a. the one assigning the obligation has some externally reliable source of authority and b. it assumes we know the facts about a situation and can make a case for an obligation which is impossible.**

**3. Good Samaritan – in order to say I want to fic x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes an moral attempt inherently immoral Thus I contend the skeptic would negate the resolution.**

**1. The skeptical conclusion being true triggers permissibility: It denies that moral obligations exist. That negates – A) Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation[[1]](#footnote-1) which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility and proving one disproves the other two. Semantics o/w – 1) it’s key to predictability since we prep based on the wording of the res and 2) it’s constitutive to the rules of debate since the judge is obligated to vote on the resolutional text B) Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent C) Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both the “P” and “~P” are true.**

## 1ar theory

**Reject 1AR Theory –**

**a) double bind – either you can put minor ink next to answer of my responses and extend your arguments to auto-win or the judge has to intervene to see if the 2ar answers to the 2n are good enough. Intervention o/w since it takes the round out of debater’s hands**

**b) they have 2 speeches on theory while I have 1 which means they can structurally preempt my answers and respond to them and I can’t do either**

**c) infinite abuse claims are wrong a) in the context of aff abuse doesn’t make sense since you can read 1ac theory and uplayer with other 1ar offs like Ks b) Spikes solve – you can just preempt paradigms in the 1AC c) Functional limits- 1nc is only 7 minutes long**

**d) they have 1 more minute on the theory debate due to a 7-6 skew which o/w since theory is mainly about substance**

**e) 2AR collapse means the aff wins every debate they can cover all my responses.**

**f) The neg is already at a huge disadvantage because the aff gets to speak first and last and gets infinite pre round prep time; new layers in the 1AR just exacerbate the skew.**

## Case

#### The aff negates –

**[1] Intellectual property is a self-expression of the subject. When it’s used in a way that doesn’t reflect the framer’s intent, it is alienating.**

Justin **Hughes 98**, "The Philosophy of Intellectual Property," 77 Georgetown L.J. 287, 330-350 (1988) [https://cyber.harvard.edu/IPCoop/88hugh2.html] AHS//MAK recut emi Accessed 8/10/21

"On the Hegelian perspective, payments from intellectual property users to the property creator are acts of recognition." 3. Intellectual Property Under Hegel. For Hegel, intellectual property need not be justified by analogy to physical property. In fact, the analogy to physical property may distort the status Hegel ascribes to personality and mental traits in relation to the will. Hegel writes: Mental aptitudes, erudition, artistic skill, even things ecclesiastical (like sermons, masses, prayers, consecration of votive objects), inventions, and so forth, become subjects of a contract, brought on to a parity, through being bought and sold, with things recognized as things. It may be asked whether the artist, scholar, &c., is from the legal point of view in possession of his art, erudition, ability to preach a sermon, sing a mass, &c., that is, whether such attainments are "things." We may hesitate to call such abilities, attainments, aptitudes, &c., "things," for while possession of these may be the subject of business dealings and contracts, as if they were things, there is also something inward and mental about it, and for this reason the Understanding may be in perplexity about how to describe such possession in legal terms. . . . n205**.** Intellectual property provides a way out of this problem, by "materializing" these personal traits.Hegel goes on to say that "[a]ttainments, eruditions, talents, and so forth, **are**, of course, owned by free mind and are something internal and not external to it, but even so, by expressing them it may embody [\*338] them in something external and alienate them." n206.Hegel takes the position that **one cannot alienate or surrender any universal element of one's self**. Hence slavery is not permissible because by "alienating the whole of my time, as crystallized in my work, I would be making into another's property the substance of my being, my universal activity and actuality, my personality." n207 Similarly, there is no right to sacrifice one's life because that is the surrender of the "comprehensive sum of external activity." n208 This doctrine supplies at least a framework to answer the question of intellectual property that most concerns Hegel. It is a question we ignore today, but one that is not easy to answer: what justifies the author in alienating copies of his work while retaining the exclusive right to reproduce further copies of that work. **A** sculptor or **painter physically embodies his will in** the medium and produces one **piece of art.** When another artist copies this piece Hegel thinks that the hand-made copy "is essentially a product of the copyist's own mental and technical ability" and does not infringe upon the original artist's property. n209 The **problem arises when a creator of intellectual property does not embody** his **will in an object** in **the** same **way the artist does**. The writer physically manifests his will only "in a series of abstract symbols" which can be rendered into "things" by mechanical processes not requiring any talent. n210 The dilemma is exacerbated by the fact that "the purpose of a product of mind is that people other than its author should understand it and make it the possession of their ideas, memory, thinking, &c." n211 This concern for the common of ideas is familiar. In resolving this dilemma, Hegel says that the alienation of a single copy of a work need not entail the right to produce facsimiles because such reproduction is one of the "universal ways and means of expression . . . which belong to [the author]." n212 Just as he does not sell himself into slavery, **the author keeps** the universal aspect of **expression as his own. The copy sold is for** the buyer's own consumption; its only purpose is to allow **the buyer to incorporate these ideas into his "self**." Hegel also identifies the instrumentalist-labor justification as a consideration against granting full rights of reproduction to buyers of individual copies [\*339] of a work. Hegel admits that protecting intellectual property is "[t]he purely negative, though the primary, means of advancing the sciences and arts." n213 Beyond this, Hegel says little. He declares that intellectual property is a "capital asset" and explicitly links this label to a later section in which he defines a "capital asset." n214 There is considerable literature on how Hegel did not develop the idea of "capital" to its logical conclusions, n215 but here "capital asset" can be understood as property which has a greater tendency to permanence and a greater ability than other property to give its own economic security

#### Truth testing negates –

**1] member[[2]](#footnote-2) is “**a part or organ of the body, especially a limb**” but an organ can’t have obligations**

**2] of[[3]](#footnote-3) is to** “expressing an age” **but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time**

**3] the[[4]](#footnote-4) is “**denoting a disease or affliction**” but the WTO isn’t a disease**

**4] to[[5]](#footnote-5) is to** “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” **but the rez doesn’t have a location**

**5] reduce[[6]](#footnote-6) is to** “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” **but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.**

**6] for[[7]](#footnote-7) is “in place of” but medicines aren’t replacing IP.**

**7] medicine[[8]](#footnote-8) is** “(especially among some North American Indian peoples) a spell, charm, or fetish believed to have healing, protective, or other power” **but you can’t have IP for a spell.**

**8] Trade means “a publication intended for persons in the entertainment business”(Merriam Webster) but a world entertainment business cannot reduce intellectual property making the resolution incoherent.**

1. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. https://www.google.com/search?q=member+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=member+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i60l3.1863j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i61l3.1473j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.1976j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://www.google.com/search?q=to+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=to+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60l3.1415j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. https://www.google.com/search?q=reduce+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&sxsrf=AOaemvI3lZsbmnXg5WHeL4m6rYGn8Vf6Aw%3A1630610232638&ei=OCMxYbCaJpO0tQb6wpGoCA&oq=reduce+definition&gs\_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyCQgjECcQRhD5ATIECAAQQzIECAAQQzIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQ6BwgAEEcQsAM6BwgAELADEEM6BwgjEOoCECc6BAgjECc6BQgAEJECOhEILhCABBCxAxCDARDHARDRAzoKCAAQsQMQgwEQQzoHCAAQsQMQQzoICAAQgAQQsQM6CAgAELEDEIMBOgoIABCABBCHAhAUSgQIQRgAUMLMBFjS3QRgnt8EaAJwAngDgAG2A4gB-heSAQozLjExLjEuMi4xmAEAoAEBsAEKyAEKwAEB&sclient=gws-wiz&ved=0ahUKEwiwlru9gOHyAhUTWs0KHXphBIUQ4dUDCA8&uact=5 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/for#:~:text=English%20Language%20Learners%20Definition%20of,meant%20to%20be%20used%20with [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. https://www.google.com/search?q=medicine+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=medicine+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59.2986j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)