## 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

### Framework

#### The starting point of morality is practical reason.

#### 1] Bindingness: A theory is only binding when you can answer the question “why should I do this?” and not continue to ask “why”. Only practical reason provides a deductive foundation for ethics since the question “why should I be rational” already concedes the authoritative power of agency since your agency is at work. Bindingness ow its meta-ethical, so it determines what counts as a warrant for a standard, so absent grounding in some metaethical framework, their arguments aren’t relevant normative considerations

#### 2] Action theory: only evaluating action through reason solves since reason is key to evaluate intent, otherwise we could infinitely divide actions. For example: If I was brewing tea, I could break up that one big action into multiple small actions. Only our intention, to brew tea unifies these actions if we were never able to unify action, we could never classify certain actions as moral or immoral since those actions would be infinitely divisible.

#### 3] Empirical uncertainty – Evil demon deceiving us or inability to know others’ experience make empiricism/induction an unreliable basis for universal ethics. Outweighs since it would be escapable since people could say they don’t experience the same.

#### And, reason must be universal –

#### [A] a reason for one agent is a reason for another agent. I can’t say 2+2=4 is true for me but not for you – that’s incoherent.

#### [B] any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends i.e. if I want to eat ice cream, I must recognize that others may affect my pursuit of that end and demand the value of my end be recognized by others, key for following rules since rules are arbitrary since the agent can form a unique interpretation and understanding which makes it impossible to verify a violation. Only universality solves since universalizing a violation of freedom entails a violation of your own freedom, thus a recognizable violation appears also means universalizability acts as a side constraint on all other frameworks.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative’s system of equal and outer freedom. 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. Thus, it is logically incoherent to justify the neg arguments/standard without first willing that we can pursue ends free from others.

#### [2] Resolvability: Clarity of weighing under our framework: perfect duties above imperfect duties. Duties in right. Explicit categories that supersede other categories. All other FWs are consequentialist that use unquantifiable prob, mag, or prob x mag.

#### [3] 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

#### [4] If reasoners capable of setting and pursuing our own ends, that means we don’t have free will which would kill any conception of morality since it only exists in opposition to immorality, if there is only one action, then it can be moral. That o/ws obligations assume that you can do otherwise, else action isn't moral just constitutive.

#### **Norwitz.[**Michael Norwitz, “Free Will and Determinism,” Philosophy Now, 1991.] SHS ZS

Inwagen presents three premises in his main argument: that **free will is** in fact **incompatible with determinism**, that **moral responsibility is incompatible with** **determinism**, and that (since we have moral responsibility) determinism is false. Hence, he concludes, we have free will. The argument for the first premise runs as follows [p.56]: “**If determinism is true**, then **our acts are the consequences of the laws of nature** and events in the remote past. But **it is not up to us what went on before we were born**, and neither is it up to us what the laws of nature are. **Therefore the consequences of these things** (including our present acts) **are not up to us**.” The argument for the second premise [p. 181]: “**If** (i) **no one is morally responsible for having failed to perform any act**, **and** (ii) **no one is morally responsible for any event**, **and** (iii) **no one is morally responsible for any state of affairs, then there is no such thing as moral responsibility**.” For the third premise van Inwagen does not present a concise summary of his line of argument. He takes it as being self-evident that we have moral responsibility, as we do, after all, continue to hold people morally responsible for their actions.

### 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.

#### 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.

## 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

#### 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.