#### Theory after phil

### FW

#### Perspectivism is true –

#### 1] Opacity – we can never access another person’s perspective because we can never fully understand who someone else is or what they think. Every truth I create cannot be universalized because I can’t guarantee that they will create the same truth because they do what they want.

#### 2] Resolvability – Centuries of moral debate proves we can’t come to an objectively correct answer so it has to be indexed to individual subjects. High school debaters can’t come to a correct conclusion on their own and moral dilemmas are too complicated to “solve” in 45 minutes, so you should prefer a perspectivist account.

#### 3] Subjectivity only has meaning when it interacts with other machines – there are no intrinsic values and a failure to recognize that stratifies subjects and reifies violence.

**Malins 04** [Brackets Original. Peta Malins (Program Manager of the Bachelor of Legal and Dispute Studies and a Lecturer in Criminology and Justice Studies @ RMIT University). “Machinic Assemblages: Deleuze, Guattari and an Ethico-Aesthetics of Drug Use”. The University of Melbourne. 2004. Accessed 2/19/21. http://janushead.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Malins.pdf //Xu]

As an assemblage, a [drug using body] has only itself, in connection with other assemblages and in relation to other bodies without organs. We will never ask what a [drug using body] means, as signified or signifier; we will not look for anything to understand in it. We will ask what it functions with, in connection with what other things it does or does not transmit intensities, in which other multiplicities its own are inserted and metamorphosed, and with what bodies without organs it makes its own converge. A [drug using body] exists only through the outside and on the outside. A [drug using body] itself is a little machine (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988: 4)1 The work of Deleuze and Guattari is perhaps best conceived of as a ‘tool box’2 –as a collection of machinic concepts that can be plugged into other machines or concepts and made to work. This is how I approach their writing, and why–despite initial misgivings–I have transformed the above excerpt (surreptitiously replacing the concept ‘book’ with ‘drug using body’) to suit the purposes of this paper. In making this transformation, I soon discovered that it became a perfect little language-machine: not only articulating where I want to take the concept of drug use, but also [through its parentheses] expressing the open applicability of Deleuze and Guattari’s work. Insert body of choice: a sexual body; a bicycle, a language; a body of art; a film–the excerpt works for them all. In this openly mutating state the passage introduces some of the key concepts in Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophical project: becomings, rhizomatic connections, and multiplicities. It also, more explicitly, outlines their project to take thought (and ethics) away from internal meanings, causes, and essences, and toward surface effects, intensities and flows. However it is the particular concept of the body activated by the excerpt–the concept of the body as machinic assemblage–that I find most useful to the task of rethinking drug use. It is a concept that unravels the modern fantasy of the body as a stable, unified, bounded entity, and gives a language to the multitude of connections that bodies form with other bodies (human and otherwise). A body’s function or potential or ‘meaning’ becomes entirely dependent on which other bodies or machines it forms an assemblage with. Colebrook’s (2002) example of the bicycle is useful here: a bicycle is a machine that doesn’t begin to work or have a particular meaning until it connects up with another machine. When it connects up with a cyclist, it becomes a vehicle; when is placed in a gallery, it becomes an artwork. A cigarette is similarly multiple: when smoked it becomes a drug; when held seductively at the end of ones fingertips it becomes an object of beauty; when shown in a film it becomes a plot device (Klein, 1993). And a drug using body is no different: when it connects up to bicycle, it becomes a cyclist; to a cigarette, a smoker; to LSD, a tripper. The drug using body is multiple. While numerous writers have begun to make movements toward rethinking drug use via Deleuze and Guattari3 , very few have explored this intersection in detail4 . In this paper I will map out some of the specific implications of rethinking the drug using body in this way. I will begin by exploring what happens to the subject (the ‘drug user’, the ‘addict’) when the body becomes a multiplicity. Like Deleuze and Guattari: I will not ask what a drug using body ‘means’ or signifies; but rather, what affects its assemblages produce and what flows of desire they cut off (its components and affects). I will then explore Deleuze and Guattari’s own particularly bleak conception of drug-use, arguing that the pessimism it engenders can be strategically sidestepped using Deleuze and Guattari’s other philosophical tools. I will explore how we might productively approach drug use via a Deleuzian ethics, and will argue for a specific ethical rethinking of drug use according to the concepts of the machinic assemblage and rhizomatic multiplicities. A strategy with implications not only for social policy, but also for how we understand ourselves. And who we might become. Subjectivity and the drug using body Bodies that fall prey to transcendence are reduced to what seems to persist across their alterations. Their very corporeality is stripped from them, in favor of a supposed substrate–soul, subjectivity, personality, identity–which in fact is no foundation at all, but an end effect, the infolding of a forcibly regularized outside. (Massumi, 1992: 112) For Deleuze and Guattari a body (human, animal, social, chemical) has no interior truth or meaning; it exists only through its external connections and affects. They write: We know nothing about a body until we know what it can do, in other words, what its affects are, how they can or cannot enter into composition with other affects, with the affects of another body. (ATP5 : 257) So where does this leave the subject? And identity? If we are to talk only of the drug using body and its multiplicities–where does the ‘drug user’ or ‘addict’ disappear to? For Deleuze and Guattari the subject is nothing more (and nothing less) than a particular way in which bodies have become organised and stratified in the post-Enlightenment social world. In order to comprehend the ‘human’ body, the social world (or socius) reduces the complexity and chaos of an ever-changing multiplicity of bodily flux to discrete categories of meaning and constancy. Bodies become ordered and delimited according to hierarchical binary presuppositions: human/animal, man/woman, healthy/unhealthy, lawful/criminal, hetero/gay, clean/junkie. Binaries that bodies never fully correspond to: No real body ever entirely coincides with either category. A body only approaches its assigned category as a limit: it becomes more or less “feminine” or more or less “masculine” depending on the degree to which it conforms to the connections and trajectories laid out for it by society… “Man” and “Woman” as such have no reality other than that of logical abstraction. (Massumi, 1992: 86) Yet when bodies fall outside these binaries, or try to claim a different identity, they are rarely granted anything outside a third term (‘bi-sexual’, ‘reformedsmoker’) that remains reliant upon, and limited to, those binary relations. Multiplicities reduced to binaries and trinities. Manifold potential reduced to a discrete set of bodily possibilities. You will be a boy or a girl; a smoker or a non-smoker; a civilized human being (with all bodily parts fulfilling civilized ‘human’ functions)’ or an animal. Your choice. You will subscribe to modern selfhood (and all its bodily and linguistic demands) or you’ll be rejected: You will be organized, you will be an organism, you will articulate your body–otherwise you’re just depraved. You will be signifier and signified, interpreter and interpreted–otherwise you’re just a deviant. You will be a subject, nailed down as one, a subject of the enunciation recoiled into a subject of the statement–otherwise you’re just a tramp. (ATP: 159)

**This commits us to practical deliberation as the method of moral inquiry   
Serra 09**Juan Pablo Serra. What Is and What Should Pragmatic Ethics Be? Some Remarks on Recent Scholarship*.* EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF PRAGMATISM AND AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY. 2009. Francisco de Vitoria College, Humanities Department, Faculty member. https://journals.openedition.org/ejpap/905

This separation of theory and practice runs parallel to another split, namely, that of ethics and morals or, better put, of ethical theory and moral practice. Peirce denies that morality is subject to rationality and thinks that ethics is valuable as a science in a broad sense. But he also regards ethics as a science which bears on human conduct only indirectly, through the examination of past actions and the self-correction of the self in view of future action. In addition, ethics would be a normative knowledge only in so far as it analyzes the adjustment of actions to ends and in so far as it studies the general way in which a good life can be lived. In morals Peirce appeals to instinct and sentiment, and in ethics he recommends the use of logical thinking —just as scientists do. However, even within the framework of his system, it’s not obvious that scientists may so easily set aside their instincts —in fact, instinct (or ‘rational instinct’ as he called it in 1908) plays a significant role in the economy of re- search. Moreover, the statement that in moral issues there may be no possibility of carrying out an inquiry that is truth-oriented is not an uncontroversial one. After all, moral inquiry is performed in a deliberative way, weighing up argumentations, beliefs and principles, and comparing them either with their probable or conceivable consequences or with lived as well as possible experiences that can be forceful or impinge upon the deliberative subject in such a way as to acquire the compulsory resistance due to reality. As Misak puts it succint- ly, “the practice of moral deliberation is responsive to experience, reason, argument, and thought experiments... Such responsiveness is part of what it is to make a moral decision and part of what it is to try to live a moral life” (2000: 52)3. Likewise, this same deliberative activity implies an effort to acquire habits, beliefs and principles that contribute to a truly free deliberation which, in turn, can result in creative conclusions. For Peirce, as you get more habit-governed, you become more creative and free, and your selfhood acquires plas- ticity and receptiveness to experience4. Vincent Colapietro has referred to Peirce’s description of human reason in terms of a deliberative rationality (1999: 24). Also, in another place he has explained that deliberation for Peirce is a process of preparation for future action which has to do with the checking of previous acts, the rehearsal in imagination of different roads to be followed by possible conduct and the nurturing of ideals (Colapietro 1997: 270, 281). It is precisely this experi- ment carried out within imagination that generates habits, because, as Peirce says in “A Survey of Pragmaticism”, “it is not the muscular action but the accompanying inward ef- forts, the acts of imagination, that produce the habit” (CP 5.479, 1907). Habits are regular ways of thinking, perceiving and interpreting that generate actions. As such, habits have a huge influence on human behavior, manifest themselves in the con- crete things we do and, at the same time, are formed within those same activities. Even more, according to Peirce, the activity takes the form of experimentation in the inner world; and the conclusion (if it comes to a definite conclusion), is that under given conditions, the interpreter will have formed the habit of acting in a given way whenever he may desire a given kind of result. The real and living logical conclusion is that habit (CP 5.491, 1907). Much more evidence could be given to support the view that habits are virtually decided (CP 2.435, c.1893) and also that intelligence comprises inward or potential actions that in- fluence the formation of habits (CP 6.286, 1893). Suffice it to say that, according to Peirce, deliberation is a function of the imagination, and that imagination is in itself an experiment which may have unexpected consequences that impose themselves upon the deliberative subject.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with pragmatic deliberation.

#### Impact Calc – deliberation is procedural, which means that agents ought to act in a deliberative fashion by employing the pragmatic procedure of deliberation, not the substance or conditions where deliberation can arise. To clarify, consequences are a sequencing question.

#### 1] Pluralistic Materialism – other theories rely on minimalistic criteria; our framework understands knowledge as changing and uses experience to base social change and revise ideas. Glaude 7Eddie S. (Eddie S. Glaude Jr. is the African-American chair of the Center for African-American Studies and the William S. Tod Professor of Religion and African-American Studies at Princeton University.) In a Shade of Blue : Pragmatism and the Politics of Black America. University of Chicago Press, 2007. EBSCOhost. (5-7)

In a Shade of Blue is my contribution to the tradition I have just sketched. My aim is to think through some of the more pressing conceptual problems confronting African American political life, and I do so as a Deweyan prag-matist. I should say a bit about what I mean by this self-description. John Dewey thought of philosophy as a form of cultural and social criticism. He held the view that philosophy, properly understood as a mode of wis-dom, ought to aid us in our efforts to overcome problematic situations and worrisome circumstances. The principal charge of the philosopher, then, is to deal with the problems of human beings, not simply with the problems of philosophers. For Dewey, over the course of his long career, this involved bridging the divide between science, broadly understood, and morals—a divide he traced to a conception of experience that has led philosophers over the centuries to tilt after windmills. Dewey declared, “The problem of restoring integration and co-operation between man’s beliefs about the world in which he lives and his beliefs about values and purposes that should direct his conduct is the deepest problem of any philosophy that is not isolated from life.”9Dewey bases this conclusion on several features of his philosophy: (1) anti foundationalism, (2) experimentalism, (3) contextualism, and (4) soli-darity.10 Antifoundationalism, of course, is the rejection of foundations of knowledge that are beyond question. Dewey, by contrast, understands knowledge to be the fruit of our undertakings as we seek “the enrichment of our immediate experience through the control over action it exercises.”11He insists that we turn our attention from supposed givens to actual consequences, pursuing a future fundamentally grounded in values shaped by experience and realized in our actions. This view makes clear the experimental function of knowledge. Dewey emphasized that knowledge entails efforts to control and select future experience and that we are always con-fronted with the possibility of error when we act. We experiment or tinker, with the understanding that all facts are fallible and, as such, occasionally afford us the opportunity for revision.12Contextualism refers to an understanding of beliefs, choices, and actions as historically conditioned. Dewey held the view that inquiry, or the pursuit of knowledge, is value-laden, in the sense that we come to problems with interests and habits that orient us one way or another, and that such pursuits are also situational, in the sense that “knowledge is pursued and produced somewhere, some when, and by someone.”13Finally, solidarity captures the associational and cooperative dimensions of Dewey’s thinking. Dewey conceives of his pragmatism as “an instrument of social improvement” aimed principally at expanding democratic life and broadening the ground of individual self-development.14Democracy, for him, constitutes more than a body of formal procedures; it is a form of life that requires constant attention if we are to secure the ideals that purportedly animate it. Individuality is understood as developing one’s unique capacities within the context of one’s social relations and one’s community. The formation of the democratic character so important to our form of associated living involves, then, a caring disposition toward the plight of our fellows and a watchful concern for the well-being of our democratic life.

#### 2] Best studies prove pluralistic tendencies are inevitable

Polzler 19[Thomas Pölzler and Jennifer Cole Wright- “Empirical research on folk moral objectivism” <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6686698/> NCBI. Published July 5th 2019]

Examining these studies' results more closely, however, makes it less clear whether this interpretation is appropriate (Pölzler, 2018b). Take again Goodwin and Darley's study. In this study, almost 30% of subjects' responses to the disagreement measure and almost 50% of their responses to the truth‐aptness measure fell on the option that the researchers took to be indicative of subjectivism (Goodwin & Darley, 2008, pp. 1347, 1351). Moreover, while some moral statements were dominantly classified as objective (e.g., the above statement about robbery), many others were dominantly classified as nonobjective (e.g., the stem cell research statement). This suggests that subjects in Goodwin and Darley's study may have actually favored what Wright, Grandjean, and McWhite (2013) called “metaethical pluralism,” i.e., they sometimes sided with objectivism and other times with nonobjectivism. More recent studies have by and large confirmed this hypothesis of folk metaethical pluralism. Wright et al. (2013) and Wright, McWhite, and Grandjean (2014), for example, replicated Goodwin and Darley's results, using the exact same measures, but letting subjects classify the presented statements as moral and nonmoral themselves. Objectivity ratings for statements that were dominantly self‐classified as moral varied between as little as 5% and as much as 85%. Research based on different measures yielded high proportions of intrapersonal variation as well (e.g., Beebe, 2014; Beebe, Qiaoan, Wysocki, & Endara, 2015; Beebe & Sackris, 2016; Fisher, Knobe, Strickland, & Keil, 2017; Goodwin & Darley, 2012; Heiphetz & Young, 2017; Wright, 2018; Zijlstra, forthcoming‐a).2

#### 3] **Frameworks all share equal value. Weighing between them becomes infinitely regressive as it presupposes there is a higher metric to determine who has the better justifications. That means contestation is vacuous which means a locus of moral duty is sufficient since it has an uncontested obligatory power.**

#### 4] Performativity- when you enter debate, you presume that you can discuss the topic because of deliberation. This means denial of my framework is impossible and all objections should be ignored on face because responding to my framework requires my framework to do so.

#### 5] Topic Lit – a pluralistic foundation is a meta-concern for the particularities of IP – 2 warrants. TJFS first frameworks are essentially T debates about the word ought which proves the better model of debate is what matters.

Kanning 12 [Michael A. Kanning (Graduate School at University of South Florida). “A Philosophical Analysis of Intellectual Property: In Defense of Instrumentalism”. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts Department of Philosophy College of Arts and Sciences University of South Florida. January 2012. Accessed 8/22/21. <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=5290&context=etd> //Xu]

In response to the insufficiencies of the classical arguments, recent works have offered a pluralistic theory of intellectual property. David Resnik suggests two positive reasons for adopting a pluralistic theory that adopts multiple normative foundations and justifying principles. First, because intellectual property is a broad and diverse field that encompasses different kinds of right that apply to different kinds of things, it is reasonable that different arguments are used to account for the diverse practices individually. Second, a pluralist theory allows for fruitful public discourse concerning intellectual property in a globalized world, where the participants in that discourse come from “different ethnic and cultural backgrounds and have different moral, philosophical and religious beliefs” (Resnik 331). A pluralistic account can overcome these disputes over foundations by encouraging a more contextual approach. To resolve IP disputes using the pluralist approach, “one must weigh and balance the different values that are at stake in the situation and determine which one should have priority” (331). How the values in a particular scenario are “ranked” can vary from one case to another. What is it then, that determines the ranking? Resnik suggests that contextual factors will make it clear what should be emphasized. As examples he suggests that in disputes about patents, utility should be emphasized because “the legal and social function of the patent system is to promote the progress of science and the natural arts”. In allocations of “intellectual credit” (i.e. academic citation practices, moral rights of authors), the interests that authors and creators have in being treated fairly should be of the highest importance (331). In these examples, though, it seems equally plausible that other values could be emphasized. Patents could be guided by an emphasis on the moral rights of the creator - they could be of unlimited term, for instance, and “intellectual credit” could be guided by utilitarian concerns (it might be that the art word would flourish if copying and imitation were totally unrestricted, both as law and in everyday practice). So what is it that guides the selection of emphasis in these cases?

### Affirm

#### IP laws prioritize uniformity and predictability as a method of homogenizing knowledge and refusing experimentation.

Wu 14 [Tim Wu (Julius Silver Professor of Law, Science and Technology at Columbia University). “Intellectual Property Experimentalism By Way of Competition Law”. Columbia Law School. 2014. Accessed 8/16/21. <https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2843&context=faculty_scholarship> //Xu]

The goals of uniformity and predictability has had its clearest implications at the international level. Unlike competition law, which varies significantly between OECD nations, over the last several decades all of the IP laws have become subject to a much stronger and geographically broader web of harmonizing international agreements, on multinational, regional and bilateral levels. The general aim of these treaties is to homogenize the world’s IP regimes, reducing or eliminating geographical variation. All of the major laws are the subject of longstanding global treaties specifying minimum protections (The Berne and Paris conventions), which were fortified in 1994 by the addition of an intellectual property agreement to the World Trade Organization, and further strengthened by numerous bilateral treaties since then. And of course the World Trade Organization, unlike the informal organizations common to competition law, has the power to punish deviations from the intellectual property treaties with serious trade sanctions. The pattern can also be observed at the national level. Both in Europe and the United States the last few decades have witnessed many important measures taken to create uniformity. In the United States, a single appeals court, the Federal Circuit, has heard the nation’s appeals in patent cases since 1982 in an effort to bring greater uniformity to the patent law. Though proposals for constructing a uniform patent court akin to the Federal Circuit in the European Union have been unsuccessful so far,26 the European Patent Convention, founded in 1973, provides a common application for the prosecution of patents in each of the member states.27 In short, stronger protection of uniform rights has been the clear trajectory of the intellectual property laws over the last few decades. That tendency is sharply at odds with the predispositions of the competition laws. The dichotomy I am suggesting here is, of course, not absolute. In certain areas of the competition law, one can sense the influence of a vested rights theory, in, for example, the resistance to breakups of dominant terms, even if the economic case for doing so might be quite strong. And there are areas in IP law, like the American fair use doctrine (a judicial and scholarly favorite), which have, in fact, served as important outlets for judicial tinkering in the face of changing conditions. For example the famous Sony decision, blessing the VCR, broke with prevalent copyright doctrine, arguably as a reaction to perceived technological necessity.28 Similarly, following a decade of bad press, Congress, the courts, and the American Patent Office have begun to make adjustments with American patent law. An example is the new post-grant review process, which includes a particular provision targeted at business method patents. Nonetheless it would be hard to describe the intellectual culture of either the intellectual property laws as truly committed to experimental improvement of the law. It would be even harder to describe competition law as devoted to the protection of fundamental rights. We are left with a divergence in intellectual cultures with broad implications for just about every advanced economy in the world. IV. USING ANTITRUST FOR PATENT EXPERIMENTALISM AT THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT I believe there is a need for a more experimentalist approach to the intellectual property laws, and particularly to the patent laws. The law, I believe, needs better mechanisms not simply to celebrate its successes, but to correct its errors, both specific and general. One way this might be achieved is to act within the structure and institutions of the laws themselves; as just discussed, this is a project underway in certain respects. But the other path is to rely on the competition laws as a kind of oversight and adjustment mechanism for the intellectual property laws.

### Method

#### 1] 1AR theory is legit – anything else means infinite abuse

#### – drop the debater – 1AR is too short to make up for the time trade-off

#### – no RVIs – 6 min 2NR means they can brute force me every time

#### – competing interps – reasonability narrows the theory debate to one issue of brightline, making it easy for the Neg to collapse to the issue in the long 2NR

#### – 1AR theory is the highest layer – the NC has 7 minutes to be abusive and 6 minutes to leverage the abuse against 1A theory in the 2N, making checking abuse lexically impossible

#### 2] Give me new weighing in the 2AR for 1AR shells – I don’t know what arguments will be read in the 2NR so 1AR weighing is impossible as I don’t know what to weigh against.