### 1

#### Interpretation: All arguments concerning fairness or education that the negative could violate must be read first in the AC.

#### Violation:

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Strat Skew – Their interp means time spent developing a substantive strategy becomes completely nullified because they’re read after substance. The neg should have to know what they have to meet before planning a strategy. That outweighs since it questions if we can access other standards.

#### 2] Topic education – Negatives are able to plan a strategy that meets your spikes so debaters can have a clean substance debate which outweighs on time frame since there’s only 2 months to debate the topic

### 2

#### A] Interpretation – The affirmative may not claim that multiple framing arguments procedurally outweigh.

#### B] Violation – They’ve independently taken the stance that actor spec, and intuitions ALL come first.

#### C] Prefer –

#### 1. Strat – It’s impossible to determine what angle to take while contesting the aff. Claiming multiple framing arguments are the highest layer means I need a strategy that links to all of them on the spot, but you get to make up the terms and choose the fwk that they all operate under.

#### 2. Infinite Abuse – Reading arguments as the highest layer justifies reading every argument as the highest layer, forcing us to answer every single argument in the aff.

#### 3. Shiftiness – If I read a separate fwk and claim it’s the most germane to government specific action, you’ll just claim that it doesn’t matter because intuitions come first in the 1AR which is arbitrary.

### 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. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

#### 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.

#### **1] We’re in a hologram**

Stromberg 15[Joseph Stromberg- “Some physicists believe we're living in a giant hologram — and it's not that far-fetched” <https://www.vox.com/2015/6/29/8847863/holographic-principle-universe-theory-physics> Vox. June 29th 2015] War Room Debate AI

Some physicists actually believe that the universe we live in might be a hologram. The idea isn't that the universe is some sort of fake simulation out of The Matrix, but rather that even though we appear to live in a three-dimensional universe, it might only have two dimensions. It's called the holographic principle. The thinking goes like this: Some distant two-dimensional surface contains all the data needed to fully describe our world — and much like in a hologram, this data is projected to appear in three dimensions. Like the characters on a TV screen, we live on a flat surface that happens to look like it has depth. It might sound absurd. But when physicists assume it's true in their calculations, all sorts of big physics problems — such as the nature of black holes and the reconciling of gravity and quantum mechanics — become much simpler to solve. In short, the laws of physics seem to make more sense when written in two dimensions than in three. "It's not considered some wild speculation among most theoretical physicists," says Leonard Susskind, the Stanford physicist who first formally defined the idea decades ago. "It's become a working, everyday tool to solve problems in physics." But there's an important distinction to be made here. There's no direct evidence that our universe actually is a two-dimensional hologram. These calculations aren't the same as a mathematical proof. Rather, they're intriguing suggestions that our universe could be a hologram. And as of yet, not all physicists believe we have a good way of testing the idea experimentally.

#### 2] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to it which makes complete tolerance impossible.

#### 3] Decision Making Paradox- We need a decision-making procedure to enact the aff, but to choose a procedure requires another meta level decision-making procedure and so forth leading to infinite regress.

#### 4] The Place Paradox- if everything exists in a place, that place must have a place that it exists in and so forth. Therefore, identifying ought statements is impossible since it assumes the space-time continuum.

#### 5] Grain Paradox- One grain falling makes no sound, but a thousand grains make a sound. A thousand nothings cannot make something which means the physical world is paradoxical.

#### 6] Arrows Paradox- If time is divided into 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 and vice versa; therefore, no model can be useful.

#### **8] All analysis fails**

Wikipedia Summarizes [Wikipedia - “Paradox of analysis” <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paradox_of_analysis>] War Room Debate AI

A [conceptual analysis](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conceptual_analysis) is something like the definition of a word. However, unlike a standard dictionary definition (which may list examples or talk about related terms as well), a completely correct analysis of a concept in terms of others seems like it should have exactly the same meaning as the original concept. Thus, in order to be correct, the analysis should be able to be used in any context where the original concept is used, without changing the meaning of the discussion in context. Conceptual analyses of this sort are a major goal of [analytic philosophy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Analytic_philosophy).

However, if such an analysis is to be useful, it should be informative. That is, it should tell us something we don't already know (or at least, something one can imagine someone might not already know). But it seems that no conceptual analysis can both meet the requirement of correctness and of informativeness, on these understandings of the requirements.

To see why, consider a potential simple analysis:

(1) For all x (any given member of a class or set), x is a brother if and only if x is a male sibling

One can say that (1) is correct because the expression "brother" represents the same concept as the expression "male sibling," and (1) seems to be informative because the two expressions are not identical. And if (1) is truly correct, then "brother" and "male sibling" must be interchangeable:

(2) For all x, x is a brother if and only if x is a brother

Yet (2) is not informative, so either (1) is not informative, or the two expressions used in (1) are not interchangeable (because they change an informative analysis into an uninformative one) so (1) is not actually correct. In other words, if the analysis is correct and informative, then (1) and (2) must be essentially equal, but this is not true because (2) is not informative. Therefore, it seems an analysis cannot be both correct and informative at the same time.

#### 9] Linguistics fail- Words have no intrinsic meaning but are constructed by signs and signifiers. For example, pencil refers to a specific image pops in your head that doesn’t replicate all pencils.

### 4

#### The standard is consistency with the categorical imperative

#### Prefer intent based frameworks

#### 1] 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

#### 2] Predictability – intent based frameworks force affirmatives to defend the whole resolution but under consequential frameworks, affs break new plans all the time which decks small schools and prevents us from engaging

#### 3] Political Education – politicians have to understand the implications of practical reason in order to know what powers they have and what they have to provide citizens and debating about Hobbes helps us learn about that.

#### 4] Resolvability – other debates create a mess of weighing and link turns, but using Kant is easily resolvable because it becomes a question of violating the cateogircal imperative

#### 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.
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