

I affirm.

Definitions:

A “nation” is a political organization with a monopoly on the legitimate use of force and regulatory authority within a geographic jurisdiction.

Intellectual property protections are laws that grant individuals and corporations the ability to enforce exclusionary regulatory authority against other individuals and the government of their jurisdiction

Topic-Independent A Prioris:

Dialetheism

Inference is the source of all knowledge. Knowledge can't come from observation alone because inference is required to determine truth based on what we see. Thus rules of inference are binding. “If this sentence is true, then the resolution is true.” This is a grammatical statement in English and *modus ponens* analysis concludes the statement is true. *Modus ponens* is a necessary rule of inference because it is how we determine that effects flow from causes; without a sense of cause and effect knowledge collapses. Thus “if this sentence is true, you must affirm.”

And, all paradoxes affirm. Paradoxes imply trivialism because they are cases where two conflicting statements are both necessarily true. This doesn't make knowledge “impossible,” rather it makes knowledge “infinite” since by paradox we can reason that every conceivable statement is true. **(This might make knowledge less *useful*, but it doesn't make knowledge less *abundant*.)**

Negative existential claim

The aff burden is to prove that there is a justification for the resolution. The neg burden is to prove that *there is no* justification for the resolution. Thus the neg must prove a negative existential claim. This is impossible for two reasons:

A) Reference paradox. To deny that something exists you have to identify what it is that does not exist; that means you have to refer to the thing that you are claiming does not exist. But if something does not exist it can't be referred to as there would be no target referent; so no statement can be *about* something that doesn't exist. In claiming in context that there is no justification for the resolution the negative concedes that “a justification for the resolution” exists and affirms.

B) Infinite source material. The range of logical possibility is infinite. To prove a negative existential claim the neg would have to identify every conceivable justification and refute them all; since the range of human creativity is infinite, it's impossible to refute every justification, therefore the neg can never meet their burden.

Infinite worlds

Each action that can unfold in more ways than one generates multiple possible worlds and there is no reason to prioritize one possible world over another. Thus infinitely many possible worlds exist. **Lewis:**

“I believe there are possible worlds other than the one we happen to inhabit. If an argument is wanted, it is this: It is uncontroversially true that things might have been otherwise than they are. I believe, and so do you, that things could have been different in countless ways. But what does this mean? Ordinary language permits the paraphrase: there are many ways things could have been besides the way that they actually are. On the face of it, this sentence is an existential quantification. It says that there exist many entities of a certain description, to wit, ‘ways things could have been’. I believe things could have been different in countless ways. I believe permissible paraphrases of what I believe; taking the paraphrase at its face value, I therefore believe in the existence of entities which might be called ‘ways things could have been’. I prefer to call them ‘possible worlds’.”
Lewis, David. *Counterfactuals*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Since the range of worlds is infinite, it is true that some world exists for every conceivable state of affairs, including a world where the resolution is true. Further, taking “infinite” in its most literal meaning, each possibility is generated infinitely many times, so there are *infinite* worlds on which the resolution is true, meeting the aff burden.

Prefer truth testing. Truth testing controls the internal link to all roles of the ballot. Truth testing comes first in logical order because if the resolution as a grammatical statement isn't true then no world described by it can valibly exist.

FRAMEWORK:

Just means “right or warranted.” To justify an action is to show that there is a reason for taking it that conforms with a conception of the good. Justify means “to make just” so justification is the affirmative burden.

Justification is a positive process because a legitimating reason renders an action just. Multiple independent legitimating reasons are possible, because there are always multiple justifications for an argument. Thus, offense against a particular legitimating reason doesn't deny the truth of alternative legitimating reasons.

Contention 1 is Egoism:

Morality derives from the self because each individual by definition arrives at their own moral choices. **Narvaez:**

“In contrast to Kohlberg's position, Blasi argued that moral action did not follow directly from a deontic judgment but was instead [is] filtered through a set of calculations that implicated the very integrity of the self. According to Blasi (1983) moral structures are only indirectly related to moral action. They serve to appraise the moral landscape, but do not directly generate action. Just because an agent appraises the social situation through the lens of sophisticated moral criteria does not guarantee that the agent will also see the personal relevance of the situation, or even its relevance for morality. The Self Model holds that action is more likely to follow moral[ity] judgment when moral considerations are deemed essential and core to [it comes from] one's personal identity. After one makes a moral judgment one must next filter this judgment through a second set of calculations that speaks to the issue of whether the self is responsible. Responsibility judgments attempt to sort out the extent to which the morally good action is strictly necessary for the self. Moreover, the criteria for reaching responsibility [Moral]”

judgments are a matter of individual differences insofar as it varies in accordance **[that vary] with one's self-definition.** Is acting in this way so necessary for my self-understanding that not to act is to lose the self? Are moral notions so central to my identity that failing to act, or indulging in excusing rationalizations, is to

undermine what is core to my personhood? Blasi suggests that **[T]he cognitive motivation for moral action comes from this sense of fidelity to [an understanding of] oneself** in-action. It springs from a tendency toward **[and] self-consistency, which** he views as **[is] a cognitive motive for objectivity and truth.** It springs from a moral identity that is deeply rooted in moral commitments — commitments so deeply rooted, in fact, that to betray these commitments is also to betray the self. Hence **moral action**, and inaction, **implicates the self** in important ways.”

Narvaez, Darcia, and Daniel K. Lapsley. "Moral identity, moral functioning, and the development of moral character." *Psychology of Learning and Motivation* 50 (2009): 237-274.

I judge that the resolution is morally correct from my perspective; thus, the resolution is true.

Contention 2 is the difference principle:

John Rawls' difference principle outlines criteria for a just society. **Wenar:**

“Rawls's second principle of justice has two parts. The first part, fair equality of opportunity, **requires that citizens** with the same talents and willingness to use them **have the same** educational and economic **opportunities regardless of whether they were born rich or poor.** “In all parts of society there are to be roughly the same prospects of culture and achievement for those similarly motivated and endowed” (JF, p. 44). So, for example, if we assume that natural endowments and the willingness to use them are evenly distributed across children born into different social classes, then within any type of occupation (generally specified) we should find that roughly one quarter of people in that occupation were born into the top 25% of the income distribution, one quarter were born into the second-highest 25% of the income distribution, one quarter were born into the second-lowest 25%, and one-quarter were born into the lowest 25%.

Since class of origin is a morally arbitrary fact about citizens, **justice does not allow [it]** class of origin **to turn into unequal opportunities .** The second part of the second principle is the difference principle, which regulates the distribution of wealth and income. Allowing inequalities of wealth and income can lead to a larger social product: higher wages can cover the costs of training and education, for example, and can provide incentives to fill jobs that are more in demand. **The difference principle allows inequalities of wealth and income, so long as these will be to** to everyone's advantage, and specifically to **the advantage of those who will be worst off.** The difference principle **[It] requires** that is, **that any economic inequalities be to the greatest advantage of those who are advantaged least.”**
Wenar, Leif. “John Rawls.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, January 2017.

Intellectual property protections benefit the most well off because (A) people born with greater intelligence arbitrarily have greater access to innovation and (B) people born with greater wealth can purchase greater access to innovations. Thus laws like IP protections that exclude the disadvantaged from access violate the difference principle and are unjust.

Contention 3 is testimony:

Right now, literally half of the debaters are the tournament are laying out justifications for the resolution being true. Depending on the round it is true either that my opponent JUST FINISHED arguing for the resolution and/or they ARE ABOUT TO argue for the resolution. Given the amount of testimony in its favor it would be ludicrous to suggest that there is no justification for the resolution, so affirm.

INTERPS

Neg must check theory interps in CX 1) promotes clash, which is necessary for debate; 2)

If neg generates more than one layer of offense; 3) Key to fairness because it gives me the opportunity to comply with interps. (1) one layer must be the highest layer and (2) they must identify the highest layer in the 1N; A) logic: potentially conflicting layers can't both be determinative or the round is irresolvable; B) reciprocity and strat skew: the neg knows what layer they want to be highest so I should know too and if only the neg knows, I can't formulate a 1AR strategy because they can always identify the highest layer in the 2N and kick out

Neg must concede aff framework and ROB. A) otherwise 6 minutes of aff is mooted denies reciprocity; B) promotes depth of topical clash - topic education is the only reason to have debate otherwise we could just take a philosophy class;

Neg theory is drop the argument A) time skew; neg has a 13-7 advantage on theory, can't let it be game over; B) debate "death penalty" isn't justified for marginal abuse

Prefer aff counterinterps A) statistical neg advantage means they already have an edge, so odds are I'm ahead on theory; B) counterinterps are lexically prior since they represent the rule the AC operates under; thus they are more credible because they represent the status quo ante; C) status quo ante controls fairness because forcing me to follow new rules introduced in the 1N gives the neg inherent advantage

Neg theory requires a jury of peers A) constitutionality trumps; I'm guaranteed no punishment without due process and I do not concede to a bench trial; B) norm setting - theory interps should be subjected to community evaluation to prevent rogue standards

And, neg side bias means theory goes aff. **Shah:**

"Affirmative and negative ballots were gathered via tabroom.com from 18 Tournaments of Champions bid-distributing tournaments on

the January-February topic across the country; Blake, Strake Jesuit, College Prep, Newark, Arizona State University, University of Puget Sound, University of Houston, Winston Churchill, Peninsula, Harvard-Westlake, Lexington, Durham Academy, Lewis & Clark, Emory, Columbia, Colleyville Heritage, Golden Desert, and University of Pennsylvania. These tournaments range from octofinal to final bid level qualifier

tournaments. This data set has **a large sample size of 4,505 rounds** and represents fairly diverse debating styles. These tournaments span the country from the west coast, where utilitarian

rounds are more predominant, to the east coast, where philosophy rounds are more prevalent. A variety of judging styles is reflected among the tournaments. When all posted ballots on the January-February topic are analyzed,

the negative won 53.04% of ballots. To test if this result is statistically significant, **the null hypothesis was set to $p = 0.5$** ,

where p is the proportion of negative wins. **The alternative hypothesis was set to $p > 0.5$.** In order **to calculate a p-value** to

determine the answer, **a one-proportion z-test was used.** As in the previous articles, the alpha is set at 0.01. **The z-test rejected the null**

hypothesis in favor of the alternative hypothesis ($p\text{-value} < 0.0001$). **[thus]** This implies there is less than a 0.01% chance that the proportion of negative wins

observed could occur if rounds are also unbiased, meaning **there is a negative side-bias."**

Shah, Sachin. "A statistical analysis of side-bias on the 2019 January-February Lincoln-Douglas Debate Topic." *NSD Update*, February 16, 2019.

A) Default aff on theory since the neg has a quantifiable arbitrary advantage; B) neg theory has no impact unless neg proves aff abuse outweighs neg side bias; and C) neg must present

empirical evidence quantifying the degree of abuse else the aff's evidence always outweighs on specificity

The AC is always the highest layer: A) time trade-off: the neg has a responsive time advantage and the aff gets to determine the terms of the debate to balance; B) time and strat skew: if the neg can generate layers higher than the AC then they can moot 6 minutes of aff speech time, gives them a massive advantage

No arguments rooted in the identity characteristics of either debater A) false assumptions - debaters don't know enough about each other to make determinations about their relative identity positions; B) safety - forcing debaters to make arguments grounded in personal identity can trigger past trauma; debaters don't have the right to impose that on each other. This tells people that based on their appearance their trauma doesn't matter. This is inherently violent.

Vote aff if I win any layer: A) logic: if I win one layer I win that the resolution is true from the perspective of that layer; B) strat skew: if I can win a layer but lose the round neg can skew my strat by collapsing to a higher layer in the 2N, mooting the entire 1AR; C) responsive reciprocity: neg has 13 responsive minutes to my 7; this balances only if any layer I go for is a potential ballot

No independent voters: A) logic: any assertion requires an evaluative mechanism so no voter can operate independent of some standard; B) strat skew: neg has to defend a top layer framing mechanism; independent voters kick that and go for alternate framing; I can't form a strat if I can't predict the top line framing

No arguments about spike placement A) key to equity because the organization choices of a writer are determined by their learning style; imposing one debater's organizational preferences on others is ableist; B) spikes control the internal link to theory about spikes, ie a prior argument that "you can't do X" can't be defeated by doing X, so neg has to engage with the underview before they can access criticisms of it.

Aff gets automatic counterinterp and RVI on all neg shells; A) logically implied - counterinterp is just "not the shell" and I obviously don't agree; B) time skew - 13-7 time advantage means I shouldn't have to spend time articulating counter interp; C) reciprocity: theory has to be a two way street; D) promotes clash and education by deterring frivolous theory;

Lexical order controls argument validity A) commitment: speaking first indicates commitment which indicates marginal credibility; ie if the neg really meant it they'd interrupt to go first; B) the aff has 100% strength of link coming out of the AC but neg positions are contradicted before they're spoken, so you have on face more reason to believe the aff