# Bronx dubs 1nc

## 1

#### A: Interpretation – Debaters must must not read impact justified frameworks. To clarify, frameworks that make ethical claims based off a certain impact without a starting justificatory point are bad.

#### B: Violation – there’s no starting point and justification of why we should care about the impacts you reference, like the imperialism, violence, and biolgical impacts caused by cybernetics – even if they’re bad u didn’t normatively prove it

#### 

#### C: Standards –

#### [1] Strat skew – Reading an impact justified framework destroys my strategy: A) Turn ground – it artificially exclude impacts from a larger framework that would justify your impact being bad which means you can cherry pick any impact that flows one direction

#### B) Limits – it makes it impossible for me to answer your framework because you can choose any impact that is always bad like racism which leaves me no ground and grants you an infinite number of impacts to defend that aren’t justified by a broader philosophy.

#### [2] Logic - you should reject impact justified frameworks because they fail to derive a moral imperative to act since they unjustifiably assume something is bad – logic outweighs because it’s a metaconstraint on what counts as an argument and this takes out the aff framing anyway.

#### Fairness comes before the AC – A] Inescapable – every argument you make concedes the authority of fairness: i.e. that the judge will evaluate your arguments fairly so if they say fairness doesn’t matter you can just vote neg because that’s unfair so who cards B] Skews ability to evaluate substance – if one debater had ten minutes to speak and the other had three there would be incongruence that alters ability to judge the winner C] Probability-theory norms are set all the time since arguments go in and out of the meta but nobody ever stops oppression with one position

#### Use competing interps –

#### A] Reasonability collapses because you have to weigh the abuse standards against the brightline

#### B] Reasonability creates a race to the bottom where debaters will be abusive right up to the brightline

C] arbitrary judge intervention

#### Drop the debater because dropping the arg is severance which moots 7 minutes of 1nc offense, it deters future abuse, and dta is inocherent since im indicting the whole aff

#### No rvis

#### a) it’s illogical for a debater to win for proving their fair; they have that burden coming into the round, b) Good theory debaters would be abusive to bait theory and then either win off the RVI or the abusive practice, c) makes ppl scared to check abuse against good theory debaters  - causes a chilling effect d) my no rvi arguments mean they can’t win off impact turns of theory ind voters because they just prove why my model is worse and nothing more

## 2

#### A: Interp – All arguments concerning fairness or education must be read first in the affirmative speech. To clarify, theory arguments/paradigm issues must be read at the top of the affirmative case before all substantive arguments. Evaluate the spirit of my interp to disincentive blippy i-meets.

#### B: Violation – Spikes on bottom

#### 

#### C. Standards –

#### 

#### 1. Strat skew – Absent spikes on top, I don’t know what I have to do until after I formulate a strategy which means I will always violate at least one of your spikes.

#### Two impacts

#### a) infinite abuse since I’ll always violate a norm and b) kills time tradeoff since I’m forced to spend all my prep restarting my strategy. My interp solves and is always net beneficial since I can understand what makes the round fair before I violate which is better for your strategy.

#### 2. Substantive engagement – I have to be able to understand the parameters for a fair strategy in order to engage in that strategy. This also allows for a better debate on the substantive layer that you want since I can spend more time thinking about a substantive strategy rather than thinking about a shell I can read on you before I get hit with 8 different spikes.

Crossapply voters

Reject case crossapps – this indicts all of their spikes in the first place which means it’s a prior question

## 3

#### Permissibility and presumption negate:

#### [1] Resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove a proactive obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### [2] 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.

#### [3] Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

#### Ethics must be derived from the constitutive features of agents – ethics based internally fail because they can’t generate universal obligations and ethics based externally fail because they are nonbinding as agents could opt-out and have no motivation to follow them which means they fail to guide action.

#### Constitutivism solves – it allows for universal obligations among all agents but they are binding and cannot be opted out of.

#### Next, only practical reason is constitutive:

#### [1] Regress – to question why one should reason concedes its authority since it is an act of reasoning itself which proves it’s binding and inescapable

#### That justifies universalizability - insofar as there is no a priori distinction between reasoners, a reason for one agent must also be a reason for another; if all agents cannot set and pursue an end, it is not constitutive of agency. Willing a maxim that violates freedom is a contradiction in conception – you cannot violate someone’s freedom without having your own freedom to do so.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with a system of equal and outer freedoms. Prefer:

#### 1] Performativity – arguing against my framework presupposes freedom because without freedom to reason you would not be able to make arguments and try to win. – this means that contesting any of my arguments proves my framework true.

#### 

Offense –

I defend the squo

#### [1] Coercion - Reducing IPP is a form of the government coercing medicine companies into giving away rights to their products – that’s is a contradiction in conception and this also takes out aff offense because companies can’t be coerced into doing something even if it might be a good under the framework – for example, you can’t coerce someone into donating to charity

**[2] Freeriding - IPP is intrinsically good because its intention is to oppose nonuniversalizable actions like freeriding and theft**

**Van Dyke 18** (Raymond Van Dyke and , 7-17-2018, "The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting", https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/ ) BHHS AK

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. Also, allowing the free taking of ideas, content and valuable data, i.e., the fruits of individual intellectual endeavor, would disrupt capitalism in a radical way. The resulting more secretive approach in support of the above free-riding Statement would be akin to a Communist environment where the State owned everything and the citizen owned nothing, i.e., the people “consented” to this. It is, accordingly, manifestly clear that no reasonable and supportable Categorical Imperative can be made for the unwarranted theft of property, whether tangible or intangible, apart from legitimate exigencies.