## 1

#### Interpretation—the aff must disclose the plan text before the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation—they didn't

#### \*Image Was Here\*

#### First is prep and clash—two internal links—a) neg prep—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply and cut and research their applications to the affirmative b) aff quality—plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn't inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, it should lose—this will answer the 1ar's claim about innovation—with 30 minutes of prep, there's still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can't check against the broader literature. Key to fairness. I can’t engage if I have no prep or clash to engage with.

#### Second is academic integrity – disclosing new affs is key to ensure that evidence isn't miscut – 4 minutes of prep isn't enough especially since I need to save some for the 2nr and also construct a 1nc. That ow because if they can lie about their, everything else they could have said is a lie and should be disregarded. Key to education otherwise we can’t learn what’s true and not.

#### 1. Fairness is a voter since the ballot asks who the better debater is and you can’t make that decision accurately if the round is unfair.

#### 2. Education is a voter, since A] it’s the only long term benefit we get out of debate, and B] it’s the reason schools fund debate.

#### 3. Drop the debater on new affs: A. Their lack of disclosure makes substance irreparable b/c our entire argument is that we did not have a basis to engage the aff to begin with. B. Drop the arg means they lose since they lose their entire advocacy and cannot have offense.

#### 4. Competing interps: A. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom where we read increasingly unfair practices that minimally fit the brightline- we should set the best norms. B. Collapses- you use offense-defense to determine reasonability being good which concedes the authority of competing interps- saying reasonability is reasonable is circular

#### 5. No RVIs: A. They incentivize debaters to go all in in theory and bait it with abusive practices, killing substantive clash on other flows. B. They can run theory on me too if I’m unfair so 1) theory is reciprocal because we’re both able to check abuse and 2) also cures time skew because they can collapse in the 2ar to their shell. C. Illogical: being fair isn’t a reason you should win, it’s a prima-facie burden for both sides.

## 2

**Permissibility and presumption negate: a) Lack of obligation proves the resolution false. Ought means moral obligation (Merriam Webster) so if the aff can’t prove there is a moral obligation, then they haven’t proven the res true. b) A statement is more likely false because any part can be false. 2 + 3 = 5 can be altered in any way and it would be false c) affirming is easier—they have infinite prep going in, speak first and last, and there is no time skew because we both have 13 minutes, meaning they get more time to make new arguments.**

#### Skep is true and negates –

#### 1] Paradoxes-

#### A] Good Samaritan- 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 to exist to solve, which makes a moral attempt inherently immoral. This also means affirming negates because you need the resolution to not have happened in order to have an obligation.

#### B] Meno’s- In order to discover something, it must already be known – this makes the quest for knowledge incomprehensible and impossible

#### C] Rule following – there in nothing inherent in a rule that mandates a certain interpretation – for example, there in nothing inherent in an arrow about showing direction. That means we can’t set moral rules because those rules need rules to interpret them – the moral rule they set is infinitely regressive.

#### D] Derrida’s – a moral action must be immediate because waiting allows for injustice to occur, however in acting early we suspend our cognitive deliberation and thus lack the ability to make a fully informed, just decision. Thus, striving for morality is inherently immoral and obligations are contradictory.

#### 2] Knowledge is infinitely regressive – in order to believe in a fact, you need knowledge of other facts to justify your belief in that fact, but the same applies to those facts, which means knowledge is infinitely regressive – epistemic skep

#### 3] Motivation double bind – either a) your framework isn’t motivational and it doesn’t guide action so obligations can’t be generated or b) morality is motivational and people will do what is says no matter what so it’s just descriptive of action, not providing an obligation

#### 4] Morality is circular - The framework starts from the premise of upholding morality. Your framework then defines what constitutes morality. That’s a double bind because either a) your framework is circular because by defining morality you are changing the burden of what your framework must be in the first place or b) morality is an undefinable concept which means normative obligations cannot be generated.

## 3

#### Interpretation: Debaters must not read theoretical justifications for their framework. To clarify, TJFs are bad

#### Violation: they read predictability and topic ed to justify their fw

#### [1]Phil-ed: kills phil ed by forcing a theory debate in framework when we are supposed to be learning about and debating philosophy. That’s an indepedant voter and controls the internal link to other voters because we need a concept of noramtivity to even care about fairness or education.

#### [2]Strat skew: TJFs force me to win on both theory and framework to win framework while you may only debate one, extending the other. Kills fairness since I have to engage on different layers with minimal time.

#### [3] Logic – theoertical justifications are bad bc regardless of whether or not the fw is philosopohically coherent tjfs ensure we apply illogical args for debates which kills education because its bad to learn about untrue things and fairness because disregarding rules of logic make it so that we’re unable to come up with argumentation – independently logic outweighs because it’s a litmus test for what counts as an argument in the first place

## Case

#### [2] The aff violates the categorical imperative and is non-universalizable- governments have a binding obligation to protect creations

**Van Dyke 18** Raymond Van Dyke, 7-17-2018, "The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting," IPWatchdog, <https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/> SJ//DA recut SJKS

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