# 1NC

### 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions in cite boxes on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki. To clarify, they can’t put “see open source.” If verbatim is not working, debaters have to make a note on the wiki in cite box positions with entry titles disclosed.

#### Violation: see the screenshot in the doc

#### Graphical user interface, application, table Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### 1] Pre-round prep- Prep becomes atrocious when you make people sift through 20 word docs to figure out which links you’re reading and which impacts to prep.

#### 2] Inclusion- Disadvantaged people have computers more prone to lag and even 3 or 4 docs can crash the program for them—Inclusion is an independent voter because it allows for people to participate and outweighs - accessibility is a multiplier for their impacts. Disclosing in cite boxes and entry titles solves—people can quickly get a summary of your position and go to open source if they need more information.

### 2

#### Interpretation: if the affirmative claims reasonable aff interps, they must claim what is reasonable in the 1ac

#### Violation: They don’t

#### Infinite abuse –

Make aff brightlines

Ill read interps thinking its

#### Violation –

#### Prefer-

#### Infinite abuse-

#### Norming is an independent voter since justifying the value of debate necessarily justifies the norms of the activity being good in order for debate to be valuable.

### 3

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### 2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### 3] Negating is harder – A] Aff gets first and last speech which control the direction of the debate B] Affirmatives can strategically uplayer in the 1ar giving them a 7-6 time skew advantage, splitting the 2nr C] They get infinite prep time

#### 4] Affirmation theory- Affirming requires unconditionally maintaining an obligation

Affirm: maintain as true.

That’s Dictionary.com- “affirm” https://www.dictionary.com/browse/affirm

#### 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.

#### 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

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Negate –

#### 1] of[[3]](#footnote-3) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 2] the[[4]](#footnote-4) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

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

#### 4] 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.

#### 6] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to the aff which means it’s impossible to have complete tolerance for ideas

#### 7] Decision Making Paradox- in order to decide to do the affirmative we need a decision-making procedure to enact it but to choose a decision-making procedure requires another decision making procedure leading to infinite regress.

#### 8] The Place Paradox- if everything exists in a place in space time, that place must also have a place that it exists in and that larger place needs a larger location to infinity. Therefore, ought statements are impossible since statements assume acting on objects in the space-time continuum.

#### 9] Grain Paradox- A single grain of millet makes no sound upon falling, but a thousand grains make a sound. But a thousand nothings cannot make something.

#### 10] Arrows Paradox- If we divide time into discrete 0-duration slices, no motion is happening in each of them, so taking them all as a whole, motion is impossible.

### 4

#### The standard is consistency with the logical consequence of the resolution. Prefer this –

#### 1. Text – Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought> //Massa

#### Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### 2. Debatability – a) my interp means debates focus on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years b) Moral oughts cannot guide action due to the is/ought fallacy – we cannot derive moral obligations from what happens in the real world

#### 3. Neg definition choice – Anything else kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

#### Their inherency proves the aff won’t happen. Either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) It is and it isn’t going to happen.

### 5

#### We’re hijacking utilitarianism - Consequentialism means determinism is true

#### 1] Induction- if x action leads to y result then x action must be influenced by prior action which means a causal chain of events structure my action rather than my will

#### 2] Focus on end states necessitates determinism because scientific models assume x will happen if y – anything else triggers permissibility

#### 3] Psychology- Neuroscience has demonstrated that our internal cognition is deterministic. Make them provide a counter study- you shouldn’t trust the word of a high-schooler about neuroscience

**Butkus** [Matthew A. Butkus(Professor in the department of Philosophy at McNeese State University, PhD - Health Care Ethics Duquesne University, MA – Philosophy Duquesne University). “Free Will and Autonomous Medical Decision-Making.” Journal of Cognition and Neuroethics. Volume 3, Issue 1. Pg 113-114. March 2015. Accessed 4/4/20. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/89a4/924e0111035dbda63d61631a169c654a04fa.pdf> //Recut Houston Memorial DX from BHPE]

**Psychology and neuroscience have demonstrated that consciousness, our day-today perception, our sense of self and identity, judgment, emotions, and intuitions are all predicated upon a number of causal cognitive elements that are outside our awareness— the bulk of our cognition is deterministic and preconscious. This determinism opens up avenues of undue influence into processes we normally assume to be under our control— it should be clear that this assumption is mistaken at best, inhuman and pernicious at worst.** We should not abandon ourselves to blind determinism, however—we possess the ability to reflect upon our motivations, and to engage in dialogic interaction with others, who may bring aspects of ourselves to the fore which would remain otherwise inaccessible. As a result, we can take back a measure of control, but only if we engage in honest dialectic and dialogue with others. In the context of patient autonomy and decision-making, the necessity of this dialogical process is especially evident—patients are already physically compromised, potentially in ways that can exert conscious and unconscious influence over their decision-making processes, above and beyond the normal potential sources of error found in heuristics and biases. Clinicians should be alert for such influences, recognizing that a medical illness can easily mask a deeper psychopathology. Affective disorders are very common, occur more in patients than in the general population, and tend to go unrecognized or dismissed as a normal reaction to their illness. The effect of these disorders, however, is quite pernicious. They fundamentally affect the efficacy of therapeutic interventions, morbidity and mortality, and rate of recovery—ignoring, dismissing, or failing to identify a comorbidity compromises the treatment of the obvious illness. By only treating the surface pathology, we potentially ignore the deeper wound. Many contemporary models of autonomy suffer from similar shortcomings—while ethics seeks to inform itself of philosophical, legal, theological, and medical constructs, it all too easily ignores the psychological, an unfortunate irony in light of the fundamental connection between cognitive and clinical psychology and ethical ideals of autonomous choice. Ethical theories that dismiss or fail to address psychological constructs are groundless; models derived from inhuman absolutes are so much fancy and fiction. What good is it to describe models of cognition that have little resemblance to how we actually think? The present autonomy model suggests that decision-making is a complex construct necessarily containing rational and emotional elements, intuitive judgments, and, as a result, potential sources of error. This seems to gel with day-to-day experience— many decisions are made by gut instinct and intuition, instead of a Cartesian rational process methodically and algorithmically exploring all possible influences, outcomes, and variables. This deterministic model gels with the phenomenon of basing day-to-day decisions upon distal causes—early education and environment, role models, learned behaviors, etc. This model suggests that as the severity of the outcomes increases to terminal, increasing reflection upon the causes and motivations of the decision is required—that a genuinely autonomous choice will explore the agent’s motivations, identifying and judging the appropriateness of each influence, determining if it is congruent with the value system adopted by the agent as a whole.

#### I defend the squo and that negates

#### 1] Actions are predetermined which means we aren’t culpable for actions we don’t take

### 6

#### 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

#### Negate

#### 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.

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.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i61l3.1473j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.1976j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://www.google.com/search?q=reduce+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&sxsrf=AOaemvI3lZsbmnXg5WHeL4m6rYGn8Vf6Aw%3A1630610232638&ei=OCMxYbCaJpO0tQb6wpGoCA&oq=reduce+definition&gs\_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyCQgjECcQRhD5ATIECAAQQzIECAAQQzIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQ6BwgAEEcQsAM6BwgAELADEEM6BwgjEOoCECc6BAgjECc6BQgAEJECOhEILhCABBCxAxCDARDHARDRAzoKCAAQsQMQgwEQQzoHCAAQsQMQQzoICAAQgAQQsQM6CAgAELEDEIMBOgoIABCABBCHAhAUSgQIQRgAUMLMBFjS3QRgnt8EaAJwAngDgAG2A4gB-heSAQozLjExLjEuMi4xmAEAoAEBsAEKyAEKwAEB&sclient=gws-wiz&ved=0ahUKEwiwlru9gOHyAhUTWs0KHXphBIUQ4dUDCA8&uact=5 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. https://www.google.com/search?q=medicine+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=medicine+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59.2986j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)