# 1NC

## 1

#### Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than whole res then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)*

#### Violation: They defend a plan and don’t

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair –

#### a) Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides.

#### b) Shiftiness-Having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things.

#### 2. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Having one also encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.

#### Fairness and education are voters – its how judges evaluate rounds and why schools fund debate

#### DTD – it’s key to norm set and deter future abuse

#### Competing interps – Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation – it also collapses since brightlines operate on an offense-defense paradigm

#### No RVIs – A – Going all in on theory kills substance education which outweighs on timeframe B - Discourages checking real abuse which outweighs on norm-setting C – Encourages theory baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly D – its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments E - Kills norm setting since debaters can never admit they’re wrong – outweighs since norm setting is the constitutive purpose of theory F – They are the logic of criminalization that over-punish people-of-color for trying to create productive discourse

## 2

#### Interpretation – Debaters must say please at least one time in every speech and cross examination.

#### They didn’t say please The net-benefit is respect, comfort and productivity. Warren 17

[Marcus Warren (Business Development Manager) “THE POWER OF PLEASE” Why is it important to say, "please" and "thank you" Pg 1 June 8, 2017. Accessed 4/11/20. [https://www.quora.com/Why-is-it-important-to-say-please-and-thank-you // Houston Memorial SC](https://www.quora.com/Why-is-it-important-to-say-please-and-thank-you%20//%20Houston%20Memorial%20SC%20%20) ]

Please: Makes a respectful request of the other individual and empowers that person to respond to your request or not. ... Clearly shows that you do not consider yourself superior to the other person, and makes that person feel comfortable. Makes it far more likely that your request will be granted.

#### This outweighs

#### A] Inclusion – Debate is already a very exclusionary space so making it more inclusive is uniquely important – this outweighs because it controls the internal link to rounds

#### B] Mental Health – Saying please fosters a space that accounts for anxiety and stress. This outweighs and is a meta level constraint on arguments because it inhibits my ability to engage. Independently, mental health means you reject all aff arguments because they cause me to be stressed

## 3

#### Interp: Debaters must talk about the oceans in their 1AC

#### Violation: they don’t

#### 1] ocean education is key to real world education because most our life comes from the ocean. Which means learning about how the oceans provides us with the most relevant information we can use

#### Dilevics 16 [Andrew Dilevics is a writer for planet aid, <https://www.planetaid.org/blog/how-ocean-pollution-affects-humans>, wlhsDT]

The ocean plays an essential role for life on earth. It provides over 70 percent  of the oxygen we breathe and over 97 percent of the world’s water supply. Everyday, the ocean is under attack from natural sources and manmade pollution. Pollution does not only affect marine life and their environment, it also affects mankind.

#### 2] Exploring the ocean makes people more literate and better informed about the real world

Ocean Research Advisory Panel (**ORAP) 2002** [ORAP, (ORAP) was formed to advise the National Ocean Research Leadership Council (NORLC) and is called on to provide independent recommendations to Federal Government. From 2006-2011, the ORAP operated as the Ocean Research and Resources Advisory Panel (ORRAP), <https://www.nopp.org/about-nopp/committees/orap/>, wlhsDT]

Quality of life, economic health, and security for people of our nation and the world are increasingly dependent upon the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. A well-informed, scientifically literate populace, capable of making judicious decisions, serves as the vanguard of our society. Yet many recent studies suggest that the general American public is not as knowledgeable about scientific and technical concepts as modern society requires, indicating the need for improved methods to address public education. Too few public education campaigns, severe shortages of well-trained teachers in scientific and technical subjects, and failure to substantially increase the numbers of underrepresented and underserved groups working in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, pose significant obstacles to achieving broad science literacy. Coordinated national efforts are needed to address these obstacles and ensure the health of the education and research enterprises that fuel the prosperity of our nation. The oceans and coasts are naturally fascinating to humans and have a vast impact on their lives. Ocean related concepts and technologies offer captivating methods for educating the public about aspects of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, and can serve as powerful tools for strengthening scientific literacy. There is, however, an equally important, intrinsic need for ocean literacy itself. Within the realm of the oceans and coastal environment, the interdependence among public need, policy decisions, and scientific and technical knowledge is particularly compelling. It is essential that the public be made aware of the many ways in which the systems of Earth, in particular, the oceans, affect everyday life, as well as the significant influence that people have on the health of the oceans and their coasts. The public must: • Understand the role of the coupled ocean-atmosphere-cryosphere system that drives our weather and climate; • Appreciate that environmental pressures introduced on land have consequences that extend through the coasts to the ocean; • Comprehend how oceanic conditions nurture the continued existence of marine ecosystems and maintenance of sustainable fish stocks; and, • Encourage exploration into promising new biotechnologies and other yet-to-be-discovered societal benefits uniquely existing within the oceans. Increasingly, scientific research in the oceans is focused on efforts to deploy observing systems that can monitor those processes of greatest impact on mankind. The use of such systems will require a better public understanding of ocean processes so that the public may use the information effectively, as well as ensure the availability of the technically trained workforce needed to operate these systems. Public education2 must be used to achieve the complementary goals of improving ocean literacy and strengthening scientific literacy across every facet of the socio-economic spectrum. Museums, aquariums, science centers, and public/cable television programming offer enriching opportunities for reaching large audiences; and, promoting lifelong learning about science and technology, and communicating the relevance of each to daily life. Existing initiatives promoting systemic reform and further implementation of the National Science Education Standards 3 (NSES) offer promising opportunities for increased public knowledge of the oceans and coasts. The inherently multidisciplinary nature of coastal and ocean systems offers an exciting context in which to teach fundamental concepts of physics, biology, chemistry, geology, and mathematics. Ideally, increased exposure to the oceans and coasts using myriad approaches will both increase public support for ocean and coastal research programs and encourage more students from diverse educational and cultural backgrounds to consider pursuing careers in ocean-related professions. In the United States, many individuals and institutions employ ocean and coastal sciences in the broader context of improving public understanding of science; however, these efforts have not been well coordinated on a national scale. To address this need, several recent meetings have been convened to consider a nationally coordinated effort, or “National Agenda”, for improving education about our coasts and oceans. Important programs initiated within the NOPP agencies offer many of the essential building blocks for a successful national program. Further, the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy and the Pew Oceans Commission are actively engaged in assessing the status of national research and education as they relate to the oceans and coasts. Through the efforts of these intra-agency programs and Commission initiatives, a consensus is rapidly emerging that is catalyzing coordination of efforts to reform public education in the ocean and coastal sciences. The NOPP is a Congressionally established umbrella organization linking the many agencies engaged in ocean sciences research and education. NOPP is thus ideally positioned to play a leadership role in the articulation and sustained implementation of this National Agenda for improving ocean literacy and strengthening scientific literacy through the use of ocean and coastal concepts.

## 4

#### Interpretation: The affirmative debater must articulate a distinct ROB in the form of a delineated text in the first affirmative speech.

#### Violation:

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Strat Skew – They can read multiple pieces of offense under different ROBs and then read a new one in the 1AR so they never lose under the ROB. it just becomes a 2NR debate about whether the ROB is better than the 1NC’s which moots engagement. That means infinite abuse – All you have to do is dump on the 1N ROB and marginally extend your warrants in the 2AR and the neg can’t do anything about it since there is no 3NR to answer the 2AR weighing or extrapolations

#### 2] Reciprocity –

#### A] restarting the ROB debate in the 1ar puts you at a 7-6 advantage– putting it in the aff makes it 13-13

#### B] you have one more speech to contest my ROB and weigh

#### C] I can only read a ROB in the 1N so you should read it in your first speech– that’s definitionally an equal burden.

## 5

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### Negate because either the aff is true meaning its bad for us to clash w/ it because it turns us into Fake News people OR it’s not meaning it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

#### a priori's 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true so it's constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

#### 1] Merriam Webster defines ‘member’ as: PENIS[[3]](#footnote-3)

#### 2] Merriam Webster defines ‘trade’ as: having a larger softcover format than that of a mass-market paperback and usually sold only in bookstores[[4]](#footnote-4)

#### 3] Merriam Webster defines ‘World’ as: a distinctive class of persons or their sphere of interest or activity[[5]](#footnote-5)

#### 4] Merriam Webster defines ‘reduce’ as: to decrease the volume and concentrate the flavor of by boiling[[6]](#footnote-6)

#### 5] Dictionary.com defines ‘intellectual’ as: a person of superior intellect.[[7]](#footnote-7)

#### 6] Dictionary.com defines ‘property’ as: an essential or distinctive attribute or quality of a thing[[8]](#footnote-8)

#### 7] Merriam Webster defines ‘protections’ as: anchoring equipment placed in cracks for safety while rock climbing[[9]](#footnote-9)

#### 8] Dictionary.com defines ‘medicine’ as: any object or practice regarded as having magical powers.[[10]](#footnote-10)

#### 9] Context doesn’t matter in the context of the res – we cant know what topic writers wanted us to debate about.

## 6

### Framework

#### The meta-ethic is procedural moral realism.

#### This entails that moral facts stem from procedures while substantive realism holds that moral truths exist independently of that in the empirical world. Prefer procedural realism –

#### [1] Collapses – the only way to verify whether something is a moral fact is by using procedures to warrant it.

#### [2] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents.

#### [3] Is/Ought Gap – we can only perceive what is, not what ought to be. It’s impossible to derive an ought statement from descriptive facts about the world, necessitating a priori premises.

#### Practical Reason is that procedure. To ask for why we should be reasoners concedes its authority since it uses reason – anything else is nonbinding and arbitrary. That hijacks their framework since you need reason to evaluate any relevant consequences.

#### Moral law must be universal—our judgements can’t only apply to ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me – any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Prefer –

#### [1] Performativity—freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we should abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place.

#### [2] All other frameworks collapse—non-Kantian theories source obligations in extrinsically good objects, but that presupposes the goodness of the rational will.

#### [3] TJFs and they outweigh since it precludes engagement on the framework layer – prefer for Resource disparities- Our framework ensures big squads don’t have a comparative advantage since debates become about quality of arguments rather than quantity - their model crowds out small schools because they have to prep for every unique advantage under each aff, every counterplan, and every disad with carded responses to each of them

### Offense

#### Reducing IP is a form of free-riding that fails the universality test, but also uses the creators of the medicine as means to an end.

Dyke 18 Dyke, Raymond. “The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting - IPWatchdog.com: Patents &amp; Patent Law.” IPWatchdog.com | Patents &amp; Patent Law, 1 Oct. 2018, www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/.//dhsNJ

As we shall see, applying Kantian logic entails first acknowledging some basic principles; that the people have a right to express themselves, that that expression (the fruits of their labor) has value and is theirs (unless consent is given otherwise), and that government is obligated to protect people and their property. Thus, an inventor or creator has a right in their own creation, which cannot be taken from them without their consent. So, employing this canon, a proposed Categorical Imperative (CI) is the following Statement: creators should be protected against the unlawful taking of their creation by others. Applying this Statement to everyone, i.e., does the Statement hold water if everyone does this, leads to a yes determination. Whether a child, a book or a prototype, creations of all sorts should be protected, and this CI stands. This result also dovetails with the purpose of government: to protect the people and their possessions by providing laws to that effect, whether for the protection of tangible or intangible things. However, a contrary proposal can be postulated: everyone should be able to use the creations of another without charge. Can this Statement rise to the level of a CI? This proposal, upon analysis would also lead to chaos. Hollywood, for example, unable to protect their films, television shows or any content, would either be out of business or have robust encryption and other trade secret protections, which would seriously undermine content distribution and consumer enjoyment. Likewise, inventors, unable to license or sell their innovations or make any money to cover R&D, would not bother to invent or also resort to strong trade secret. Why even create? This approach thus undermines and greatly hinders the distribution of ideas in a free society, which is contrary to the paradigm of the U.S. patent and copyright systems, which promotes dissemination. By allowing freeriding, innovation and creativity would be thwarted (or at least not encouraged) and trade secret protection would become the mainstay for society with the heightened distrust.

## 8

#### [6] Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to

#### [7] DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up blippy 20 second shells in the 2AR but I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention

#### [8] RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew

#### No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A] New 1ar paradigms moot any 1NC theoretical offense B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested

## Case

### Underview

#### 1ar theory doesn’t come first – just because ur spending time doesn’t mean its abusive and u have a 7-6 time skew on it independently

#### No aff rvis – cross apply my warrant. A] 7-6 time skew means we get screwed every round. B] Theory good – it creates good norms and allows us to innovate args. C] No loss of substance edu – we can read cards and args. D] Time skew nonuq – 13 mins for each debater.

### Framework

#### Reject consequentialism:

#### 1. Problem of induction

Vickers 14, John Vickers, 2014, The Problem of Induction, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/induction-problem/

The original problem of induction can be simply put. It concerns the support or justification of inductive methods; methods that predict or infer, in Hume's words, that “instances of which we have had no experience resemble those of which we have had experience” (THN, 89). Such methods are clearly essential in scientific reasoning as well as in the conduct of our everyday affairs. The problem is how to support or justify them and it leads to a dilemma: the principle cannot be proved deductively, for it is contingent, and only necessary truths can be proved deductively. Nor can it be supported inductively—by arguing that it has always or usually been reliable in the past—for that would beg the question by assuming just what is to be proved.

#### Takes out their offense since it is predicated on using past experiences.

#### On extinction first and blum

#### A] Begs the question of uncertainty- I’ll destroy you on the framework debate so there don’t be uncertainty

#### B] Definitionally the fallacy of origin—just because life is a prerequisite for anything doesn’t mean that it comes first.

#### C] Circular justification—pursuing objective truth as a consequence presupposes a consequentialism framework, but the same argument is being used to justify consequentialism.

#### D] policy paralysis because everything has a “risk” of extinction—we can’t do anything because all alternatives have a link to extinction.

#### E] We can’t aggregate knowledge. Putting people together doesn’t mean more knowledge, so having more lives and time won’t achieve ethical consensus.

#### On IF

#### A] There’s an intent-foresight distinction

Hegel (George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *The Philosophy of Right*, 1820)

**The will has** before it **an outer reality**, upon which it operates. But to be able **to do this, it must have a representation of** this **reality**. True **responsibility** **is** **mine only** in **so far as the outer reality** **was within my consciousness**. The will, because this external matter is supplied to it, is finite; or rather because it is finite, the matter is supplied. When I think and will rationally, I am not at this standpoint of finitude, nor is the object I act upon something opposed to me. The finite always has limit and boundary. There stands opposed to me that which is other than I, something accidental and externally necessary; it may or may not fall into agreement with me. But I am only what relates to my freedom; and the act is the purport of my will only in so far as I am aware of it. Œdipus, who unwittingly slew his father, is not to be arraigned as a patricide. In the ancient laws, however, less value was attached to the subjective side of the act than is done to-day. Hence arose amongst the ancients asylums, where the fugitive from revenge might be received and protected. 118. **An act**, when it has become an external reality, and is connected with a varied outer necessity, has manifold consequences. These consequences, being the visible shape, whose soul is the end of action, belong to the act. But at the same time the inner act, **when realized** as an end **in the external world**, **is handed** over **to external forces, which attach** to it **something** quite **different from what it is in itself**, **and thus carry** it away into **strange** and **distant consequences. It is the right of the will to adopt only the first consequences, since they alone lie in the purpose.**

#### On AOD

#### A] Act-omission distinction is necessary since otherwise there’d be infinite obligations.

#### On degrees of wrongness

#### A] We solve – weighing between perfect or imperfect duties, duties in right, etc means we can also determine degrees of wrongness

#### On ASPEC

#### A] We aspec too – Germany uses Kantianism in their govt and we consider intent in govt action – courts prove.

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/member [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/trade [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/world [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reduce [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. https://www.dictionary.com/browse/intellectual [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. https://www.dictionary.com/browse/property [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/protection [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. https://www.dictionary.com/browse/medicine [↑](#footnote-ref-10)