Off case –

The aff argues that their framework provides a moral reason to affirm. To win this, they must win that morality is possible and exists. If I prove that morality does not exist then that is sufficient to negate because the aff would not have proved a moral obligation to affirm.

Presumption Negates

1. We presume things false, this is why people don’t believe things like conspiracy theories.

2. There are an infinite number of ways to prove something false and only one way to prove it true.

3. The neg burden is to deny the evidence of truth so if there’s no offense as to why the resolution is true the neg has fulfilled their burden.

Permissibility Negates 1.

The aff must prove an obligation because ought indicates a moral obligation. If an action is permissible, definitionally, no obligation is present and you negate.

Morality does not exist for \_\_ reasons:

1. External world skep: The only way we know the world exists is through our 5 senses. However, the only way to confirm the validity of our 5 senses is with our 5 senses. There is no external way to confirm our experience because we are constrained by it. Therefore, we are unable to confirm the existence of knowledge in the world. If the world isn’t real there’s no morality because there’s no implication to our actions.

2. Morality requires objectivity to reason. However, we are influenced by arbitrary external factors through which we see all new arguments. This makes morality impossible. Street:

Where I think the objection goes wrong, then, is as follows. The objection gains its plausibility by suggesting that rational reflection provides some means of standing apart from our evaluative judgments, sorting through them, and gradually separating out the true ones from the false—as if with the aid of some uncontaminated tool. But this picture cannot be right. For what rational reflection about evaluative matters involves, inescapably, is assessing some evaluative judgments in terms of others. Rational reflection must always proceed from some evaluative standpoint; it must work from some evaluative premises; it must treat some evaluative judgments as fixed, if only for the time being, as the assessment of other evaluative judgments is undertaken. In rational reflection, one does not stand completely apart from one’s starting fund of evaluative judgments: rather, one uses them, reasons in terms of them, holds some of them up for examination in light of others. The widespread consensus that the method of reflective equilibrium, broadly understood, is our sole means of proceeding in ethics is an acknowledgment of this fact**:** ultimately, we can test our evaluative judgments only by testing their consistency with our other evaluative judgments, combined of course with judgments about the (nonevaluative) facts. Thus, if the fund of evaluative judgments with which human reflection began was thoroughly contaminated with illegitimate influence—and the objector has offered no reason to doubt this part of the argument—then the tools of rational reflection were equally contaminated, for the latter are always just a subset of the former. It follows that all our reflection over the ages has really just been a process of assessing evaluative judgments that are mostly off the mark in terms of others that are mostly off the mark. And reflection of this kind isn’t going to get one any closer to evaluative truth, any more than sorting through contaminated materials with contaminated tools is going to get one closer to purity. So long as we assume that there is no relation between evolutionary influences and evaluative truth, the appeal to rational reflection offers no escape from the conclusion that, in the absence of an incredible coincidence, most of our evaluative judgments are likely to be false.

Street, Sharon. “A Darwinian Dilemma for Realist Theories of Value.” Philosophical Studies January 2006. Pgs 118-121

2. To is defined in the oxford dictionary as “expressing motion in the direction of” but that means the resolution is incoherent because the word ought cannot move to the word reduce. Means you negate on face because you can’t even know what the resolution looks like and an incoherent claim can’t have truth.

4. Nations means “a North American Indian people or confederation of peoples.”(Oxford Dictionary, but this doesn’t apply to the WTO, so the resolution is false

5. Free will does not exist. Scientific research confirms that our subconscious makes decisions for us. Therefore, we are not morally responsible for our actions and morality does not exist. **Stenger:**

**“Research in neuroscience has revealed** a startling fact **that** revolutionizes much of what we humans have previously taken for granted about our interactions with the world outside our heads: **Our consciousness is really not in charge of our behavior.** Laboratory **experiments show that before we become aware of making a decision, our brains have already** laid the groundwork for **[made] it.** In a recent book, *Subliminal: How Your Unconscious Mind Rules Your Behavior*, physicist Leonard Mlodinow reviews a wide range of psychological experiments that demonstrate the dominant role the unconscious plays in our behavior. **This** recognition **challenges fundamental assumptions about free will** and the associated religious teachings about sin and redemption, **as well as** our judicial concepts of **responsibility** and punishment. If **our brains are making our decisions for us [without our willing input]** subconsciously, how can **[Thus] we [cannot] be responsible for our actions**? How can our legal system punish criminals or God punish sinners who aren't in full control of their decision-making processes? Is free will an illusion? In his recent book titled *Free Will,* neuroscientist Sam Harris pulls no punches. He tells us in no uncertain terms: "Free will is an illusion." We don't exist as immaterial conscious controllers, but are instead entirely physical beings whose decisions and behaviors are the fully caused products of the brain and body**.”**

Stenger, Victor. “Free will is an illusion.” *Huffington Post,* 6-1-2012.

#### **[1]** Member is defined as “A part or organ of the body” (Oxford Dictionary), but this doesn’t apply to the WTO so the res is false

#### **[3]** Protection means “Patronage” (Dictionary,com), but this doesn’t apply to what the WTO and it’s members can do so the resolution is impossible and you auto-negate

#### **[4]** For means “On behalf of or to the benefit of (someone or something).” (Oxford dictionary). But this can’t apply to intellectual property so the res is incoherent.

#### **[5]** For means “in place of” (Merriam Webster), but Intellectual Property protections aren’t in place of medicines so the res is incoherent

[6] For means “in honor of” (Merriam Webster), but Intellectual property isn’t in honor of medicines so the res is false

[7] The means “Used adverbially with comparatives to indicate how one amount or degree something varies in relation to another.” (Oxford dictionary). But this means the resolution is incoherent thus you negate.

#### **[6] To go anywhere, you must go halfway first, and then you must go half of the remaining distance, and half of the remaining distance, and so forth to infinity – thus, motion is impossible because it necessitates traversing an infinite number of spaces in a finite amount of time.**

#### **[7] In order to say I want to fix x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the desire of the problem’s existence to solve, which makes any moral attempt inherently immoral – meaning affirming is impossible.**

#### **[8] you can’t be sure anything besides yourself exists – we could be deceived by a demon, dreaming, or in a simulation so the whole world could be nonexistent**

#### **[9] Rule following fails a) We can infinitely question why to follow that rule, as all rules will terminate at the assertion of some principle with no further justification b) Rule are arbitrary since the agent has the ability to formulate a unique understanding of them. It becomes impossible to say someone is violating a rule, since they can always perceive their actions as a non-violation.**

#### **[6] The holographic principle is the most reasonable conclusion**

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.**

#### **[9] 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.**

#### **[10] 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.**

#### **[11] 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.**

#### [1] 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.