## 1

#### A: Interp – All arguments concerning fairness or education that the negative could violate must be read first in the affirmative speech. To clarify, theory arguments 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 ill 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. Also, means independent reason to vote since the goal of the debate round is to ultimately get back to substance, so I preclude. My interp is also key to real world ed since always get the rulebook before we do the activity. Real world education is an independent reason to prefer the interpretation since it is the only skill that can affect us outside of rounds.

#### Voters –

## 2

#### 1. Logic: Debate is fundamentally a game with rules, which requires the better competitor to win. Every other ROB is just a reason why there are other ways to play the game but are not consistent enough with the purpose of the game to vote on, just like you don't win a basketball game for shooting the most 3s.

#### 3. Isomorphism: ROBs that aren't phrased as binaries maximize leeway for interpretation as to who is winning offense. Scalar framing mechanisms necessitate that the judge has to intervene to see who is closest at solving a problem. Truth testing solves since it's solely a question of if something is true or false, there isn't a closest estimate.

#### 6. Constitutivism: the ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic and five dictionaries  define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm  as to prove true b) the purpose of debate is the acquisition of knowledge in pursuit of truth – a resolutional focus is key to depth of exploration which o/w on specificity. It's a jurisdictional issue since it questions whether the judge should go outside the scope of the game.

## 3

#### Prefer on neg definition choice – the aff should have defined ought in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable contestation, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition. Also, better since it focuses on real world instances rather than recycling old frameworks and evaluate after the 1N so we both have one speech which is key to reciprocity.

#### Negate:

#### [Negate –

#### 2] of[[1]](#footnote-1) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 3] the[[2]](#footnote-2) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

#### 4] to[[3]](#footnote-3) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### 5] reduce[[4]](#footnote-4) is to “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.

#### 6] for[[5]](#footnote-5) is “in place of” but medicines aren’t replacing IP.

#### 7] medicine[[6]](#footnote-6) 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] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t logically going to happen, and fairness is terminally unquantifiable.

#### [9] In order to say I want to fix x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes any moral attempt inherently immoral.

#### [10] To go anywhere, you must go halfway first, and then you must go half of the remaining distance ad infinitum – thus, motion is impossible because it necessitates traversing an infinite number of spaces in finite time and theory is paradoxical since it uses arguments to justify being unable to make arguments

#### [11] In order to find the answer to a question, you must ask if there is an answer, otherwise asking the question is pointless, but that requires asking whether or not there’s an answer to that question and so forth ad infinitum – this means the quest for knowledge fails and the acquisition of truth is impossible – negate since we can’t ensure resolutional truth value.

## Case

#### Reject 1AR Theory They have 7-6 time skew They have two speeches on theory and I have one which is def irreciporcal Its not inf abuse because I only have 7 mins If you don’t buy that, Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is crazy aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing crazy abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance. DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it. No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A~ the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense B~ introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested which o/w’s on time frame since we can set higher quality norms. NEW 2N PARADIGMS

#### Kant triggers permissibility.

#### 1. We can never know the intention of another agent. Nietzsche,

Human, All Too Human. Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche Translated by R. J Hollingdale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

**Our experience of another person**, for example, no matter how close he stand to us, **can never be complete, so that we would have a logical right to** a total **evaluation of him; all evaluations are premature and are bound to be.** Finally, **the standard by which we measure, our own being, is** not an unalterable magnitude, we are **subject to moods and fluctuations, and yet we would have to know ourselves as** a **fixed** standard **to** be able justly to **assess the relation between ourself and anything else** whatever.

#### 2. Even our best guesses at intention are flawed; this makes any evaluation impossible.

Taylor, “Thine eyes hath not seen the virtue: A response to Kant’s theory of a priori morality.” 2010. <http://charactervertigo.com/thine-eyes-hath-not-seen-the-virtue-a-response-to-kants-theory-of-a-priori-morality>.

On **[With] the intentionalist model**, it becomes extremely difficult to judge our fellow human beings. In fact, **it becomes impossible to make** certain **judgments about** their **moral rectitude because we cannot have access to** their **private states of willing. We look at** someone like **Hitler and say “Obviously evil”, but the intentionalist can raise all sorts of things like:** “Well, yes,it looks bad, but **it’s possible he was so insane that he** truly **thought that his actions were for the betterment of mankind**…maybe he thought the Jews would be better off…maybe he etc., etc**.**” – you know, **[the intentionalist can] make up categorical-imperatively-sound reasons for his actions, as far-fetched as they may be.** Or, he was an angry, power-hungry bastard. Pick which seems more likely, but **we can never know for certain, if we’re Kantians.**

#### That negates –

#### 1. Ought is a moral obligation[[7]](#footnote-7) which means a lack of obligation proves the resolution false - the res specifically says you have to prove obligation, you cannot be obligated and lack an obligation simultaneously.

#### 2. To negate[[8]](#footnote-8) means to deny the truth of which means that any action that proves a lack of obligation negates.

#### 3.

#### 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.

#### IP protections are consistent with libertarian theories of property

Zeidman 16 Zeidman, Bob. “Why Libertarians Should Support a Strong Patent System - Ipwatchdog.com: Patents &amp; Patent Law.” IPWatchdog.com | Patents &amp; Patent Law, 5 Jan. 2016, www.ipwatchdog.com/2016/01/05/why-libertarians-should-support-a-strong-patent-system/id=64438/.//dhsNJ

Ayn Rand strongly supported patents. In her book “Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal,” she states: An idea as such cannot be protected until it has been given a material form. An invention has to be embodied in a physical model before it can be patented; a story has to be written or printed. But what the patent or copyright protects is not the physical object as such, but the idea which it embodies. By forbidding an unauthorized reproduction of the object, the law declares, in effect, that the physical labor of copying is not the source of the object’s value, that that value is created by the originator of the idea and may not be used without his consent; thus the law establishes the property right of a mind to that which it has brought into existence. Many libertarians believe that intellectual property, being intangible, is not real property. A formal libertarian definition of property is difficult to formulate, but we would say that property is that which can be produced or contribute to production. Intellectual property falls clearly within these constraints. Yet some libertarians complain that intellectual is not tangible and is defined by government regulation—the patent laws—such that it would not exist without government definition. Let us look at this argument closer. Land is unquestionably property in the minds of libertarians. Yet the land upon which a house is built was not created by the property owner. It was created by nature or God, depending on your inclination, but no one would claim it to be created by the owner, whereas intellectual property is unquestionably created by the inventor. And how far do property lines extend? Property lines are determined by local governments. One can argue that property lines are negotiated by owners and enforced by governments, but when we moved into our homes, there were no negotiations with surrounding property owners. And how far above ground and below ground do property rights extend? These limitations are definitely not negotiated with other property owners but are determined by laws enforced by governments. Patents also have limitations in terms of scope and time that are determined by government laws. One can see that limitations on patents are similar to those on physical property and in some respects are more closely connected to production. For these reasons, libertarians should recognize patents as they do other forms of property. As a secondary but important example, libertarians are generally concerned about government spying on private conversations. When the government captures a phone conversation, it is not physically taking property. It is simply copying intangible data that exists as a form of transient electrical signals. Copying does not involve removing the original—the phone conversation is not destroyed when it is copied. Yet libertarians recognize that this copying of intangible data is a kind of theft of property. Libertarians should thus be wary of making the argument that intangible patents cannot be property or they may lose their contrary argument that private conversations are personal property to be protected.
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