# 1NC

### 1

#### Interpretation: If a debater reads a consequentialist framework, then they must specify in a delineated text which theory of good they defend. (Eg hedonism, act vs rule util, eudaimonia).

#### Violation: They are consequentialist – that was CX and they don’t even have a standard.

#### 1 – Shiftiness – They can shift out of disads and case turns by reframing their vague theory of good. That’s true here because their justifications have different implications for different versions of consequentialism and I would not know until the 1AR which moots 1NC offense.

#### 2 – Strat skew – I lose the 6 mins spent in the 1AC trying to develop a strategy since I don’t know what turns or case specific arguments would link under the standard whereas they clearly know that links under my standard.

#### 3 – Resolvability – They make the round irresolvable because the judge has no idea how to evaluate offense absent specification. That’s an independent voter because judges need to resolve debates to make a decision.

#### 4 – CX doesn’t check –

#### A] Guts pre-round prep which is best for research

#### B] It’s not binding and judges don’t pay attention

#### Vote on fairness – abuse skews your evaluation of substance – precedes education since if there’s abuse, you can’t expect me to clash. Drop the debater – I can’t respond to a new aff in the 2NR since I don’t have a 3NR to defend my offense – link turns 1AR theory – proves the aff forced me to be abusive.

#### No RVIs on spec: (A) The 1AR would just sit on the shell so I’ll always lose to the unchecked 2AR collapse—also means evaluate theory after the 2NR. (B) Chills legit theory which leads to a race to the bottom—outweighs deterrence since you could just beat a bad theory shell. Use competing interps—either there’s a bright line which collapses, or there isn’t which causes intervention.

### 2

#### The meta-ethic is practical reason:

#### A – Action theory – any action can be infinitely subdivided into smaller actions. For example, my walk to the door can be split into steps, movements, or moments in time. Only practical reason, i.e. my intention to walk to the door, can unify these pieces into a single, coherent action.

#### B – Bindingness – external accounts of the good cannot motivate action since we can always ask *why* we should care about that thing. Only practical reason solves regress since ‘why should I follow reason’ is asking for a reason, conceding its authority – proves my framework is inescapable and that others collapse.

#### Next, actions must be willed freely from the choices of others. Otherwise, that would violate practical reason since you cannot will your unfreedom while also relying on your freedom to act to begin with. But, agents can’t wholly control what others do so they must form a state with the power to will the freedom of all.

#### Thus, the standard is protecting equal outer freedom. Impact calc—only intents matter—

#### A] Induction fails – it begs the question because it uses the past to predict the future but we only assume this is true because it’s worked in the past which is circular.

#### B] Aggregation’s impossible – freedom is a property of action and not a countable object. Saying that two free actions are “more free” than one actions is like saying two circles are more “circular” than one.

#### Prefer additionally –

#### [1] Performativity – Debate is an exchange of ideas, which requires that we respect each other as free, independent persons who seek ethical truth. Every response you make presupposes it. This respect extends to other people, since they are also agents who engage in dialogue.

#### [2] TJFs –

#### A] Critical thinking – Our framework forces you to make analytic arguments about the nature of IP – details like the geopolitical effects don’t matter because none of us will ever be in a position to pass policies – but, we all make decisions in everyday life.

#### B] Small schools – Util debates reward debaters with more resources like coaches and backfiles – structural abuse outweighs – it rewards debaters because of factors outside of their control.

#### Negate –

#### 1 – Absence of IPP allows free-riding where individuals use others’ work. Free-riding violates equal freedom.

Ripstein '9 (Arthur Ripstein; Arthur Ripstein is Professor of Law and Philosophy and University Professor. He was appointed to the Department of Philosophy in 1987, promoted to Full Professor in 1996, appointed to the Faculty of Law in 1999, and appointed to the rank of University Professor in 2016. He received a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Pittsburgh, a master’s degree in law from Yale, and an undergraduate degree from the University of Manitoba. He was Chair of the Philosophy Department 2011-14 and Acting Chair 2019-20; 10-15-2009; *Force and Freedom*, accessed 8-20-2020; JPark Bracketed for Gendered Language)

So mandatory cooperation cannot treat terms of interaction as reciprocal because they are voluntary. Instead, there is a more direct requirement of reciprocity: everyone must do [their] ~~his or her~~ own part; the person who fails to do so violates reciprocity by taking advantage of the cooperative efforts of others, like the one who fails to keep up his end of a contract. From this perspective, the “free rider” wrongs his fellow citizens by taking advantage of their efforts. The free rider may claim—and it may even be true— that [they] ~~he~~ would rather do without the rightful condition and go it alone. That claim is beside the point, because the obligation to enter a rightful condition is unconditional, that is, it does not depend upon any particular person’s subjective assessment of the benefits it will yield. Others are entitled to treat the creating and sustaining of a rightful condition as one of the free rider’s purposes, quite apart from what he may have to say about it. Thus they can rightly complain that they are being required to work for the purposes of another, or that they are being used by the free rider, and they can make this claim even if the free rider’s failure to con- tribute costs them nothing. The mandatory character of such cooperation generates a presumption in favor of an equal division of its burdens. Kant suggests that legislation that “goes against the law of equality in assigning the burdens of the state in matters of taxation, recruiting and so forth”30 is defective. Citizens are entitled to petition against such laws, because equal division is the basic case of mandatory cooperation. If everyone must do his or her part in jointly providing public spaces, those parts will be equal unless there are positive grounds for differentiation.

#### 2 – The government is obligated to protect IP. The inventor has a right to own their creation. The same applies to intellectual property. A world where everyone can use the inventions of another without consent is stealing which violates the categorical imperative since people who steal do not wish to be stolen from.

### 3

#### Interpretation: The plan must be permanent.

#### Violation: They don’t reduce IP when there is no global public health emergency – that was CX.

#### Standard is ground – (extempted)

### Case