### 1

#### A. Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than the explicit topic then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)*

#### B. Violation:

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair –

#### a) Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides.

#### b) Shiftiness-Having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things.

#### 2. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Having one also encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.

### 2

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must specify to what degree they reduce intellectual property protections.

#### Reduce requires quantification.

Passarello 13 – J.D. Candidate, Duke University School of Law, 2013. (Nicholas, NOTE: THE ITEM VETO AND THE THREAT OF APPROPRIATIONS BUNDLING IN ALASKA, 30 Alaska L. Rev. 125, Lexis)//BB

With respect to the item veto power, the question in the case was whether or not the governor could strike descriptive language without affecting the rest of the appropriation. The state constitution clearly guarantees the power to "strike or reduce items in appropriations bills." 61 To determine what exactly it is that the governor may strike, the Alaska Supreme Court here addressed the meaning of "item" for the first time. 62 The court concluded that "item" means "a sum of money dedicated to a particular purpose." 63 This holding rested on five lines of analysis, all of which indicate that the amount of an appropriation is the object affected by the item veto power. First, the court noted that the word "item" implies "a notion of unity between two essential elements of an appropriation: the amount and the purpose." 64 Altering the amount of an item is expressly allowed in the Constitution via the reduction power, 65 but to alter the purpose would destroy that unity by fundamentally changing the item into something else not enacted by the legislature. 66 Second, the use of the word "reduce" implies a quantitative effect**,** and the drafters likely intended the companion word "strike" to [\*136] have the same type of effect as well. 67 Third, "**reduce**" and "strike" **describe** the same **action applied to different extents:** **when an amount is "reduced**" **to the point where it is lessened to nothing**, **it is effectively "struck."** 68 **Thus, the object** of the "strike" **must be associated with an amount** of money **to the extent** **that it can be lessened**. 69 Fourth, the historical purpose of the item veto was to curtail the amount of state spending by mitigating the effects of log-rolling, a purpose most closely directed at the amount of the appropriation. 70 Fifth, "public policy disfavors a reading of "item' that would permit the executive branch to substantively alter the legislature's appropriation bills, resulting in appropriations passed without the protection our constitution contemplates." 71 For these reasons, the court concluded that the power to "strike" only refers to completely diminishing the amount of an appropriations item, not the descriptive language accompanying it.

#### 2] Violation: they don’t

#### 3] Standards

#### a] Shiftiness – vague plan wording wrecks Neg Ground since it’s impossible to know which DAs link or which CPs are competitive since different IP’s have different implications – absent 1AC specification, the 1AR can squirrel out of links by saying they don’t effect a certain protection or they don’t reduce IP enough to trigger the link.

#### CX doesn’t check - 1] Skews pre-round prep – key to in-depth clash, 2] Judges don’t flow CX, 3] Unverifiable and Irresolvable,

#### Independently vote Negative on Presumption since the Aff gets struck down for being void-for-vagueness since they don’t have an explanation of what is reduced or remaining after the Plan.

#### b] Topic Education – nuanced debates about IP requires specification since each form of IPR has specific issues related to it so generalization disincentivizes in-depth research. Topic Education is a voter since we only debate the topic for two months.

#### Reductions Spec isn’t regressive – it’s a core discussion central to the literature, we’ve read a card proving predictability, and is a floor for topic debates.

### 3

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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

#### 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.

#### Merriam Webster defines ‘World’ as: a distinctive class of persons or their sphere of interest or activity[[3]](#footnote-3)

#### Merriam Webster defines ‘reduce’ as: to decrease the volume and concentrate the flavor of by boiling[[4]](#footnote-4)

#### Dictionary.com defines ‘intellectual’ as: a person of superior intellect.[[5]](#footnote-5)

#### Dictionary.com defines ‘medicine’ as: any object or practice regarded as having magical powers.[[6]](#footnote-6)

#### 2] 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 an idea since that tolerance relies on excluding a perspective.

#### 3] Decision Making Paradox- in order to decide to do the affirmative we need a decision-making procedure to enact it, vote for it, and to determine it is a good decision. But to chose a decision-making procedure requires another meta level decision making procedure leading to infinite regress since every decision requires another decision to chose how to make a decision.

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

#### 5] 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 which means the physical world is paradoxical.

#### 6] 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.

#### 7] Bonini’s Paradox- As a model of a complex system becomes more complete, it becomes less understandable; for it to be more understandable it must be less complete and therefore less accurate. Therefore no philosophical or political model can be useful.

### 4

#### 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. Reject Extinction outweighs- aggregation is nonsensical since a] it impedes on one persons ends for another and b] assumes everyone values the same thing.

#### 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

#### No new 1AR framework justifications – Anything else kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement off of the 1AC – It also justifies overloading the 2NR with new arguments.

#### 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.
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