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#### This is repugnant – advocating determinism actually causes unethical actions – rigorous empirics, Vohs and Schooler 08,

Kathleen D. Vohs, [Kathleen Vohs, Distinguished McKnight University Professor and Land O'Lakes Chair in Marketing, works to understand and communicate the basics of how people think, feel, and behave in order to make sense of marketplace and organizational outcomes. Vohs's research specialties include self-control, the hidden costs of decision making, the psychology of money, the difference between a meaningful and happy life, and heterosexual sexual negotiations. She has authored more than 250 scholarly publications and has been the editor of 9 books.] and Jonathan W. Schooler, [Jonathan earned his BA at Hamilton College in 1981 and his Ph. D. at the University of Washington in 1987. He joined the psychology faculty of the University of Pittsburgh as an assistant professor that same year and became a research scientist at Pittsburgh's Learning Research and Development Center.], “The Value of Believing in Free Will: Encouraging a Belief in Determinism Increases Cheating,” February 2008, <https://assets.csom.umn.edu/assets/91974.pdf>. //LHP AV Accessed 12/1/20 \*methodology is in the block of text in the middle\*

* Passive cheating = they have to avoid something cheat-y happening to them – ie they hit the spacebar to prevent seeing the right answer
* Active cheating – they actively decide to overpay themselves compared to what they deserve
* Card provides uniqueness that most people believe in free will strongly BUT advocating determism, even briefly, causes people to change their beliefs – beliefs on free will are easily pliable. This also means the story in the 2AR about how even if they kick out of determinism they should still lose is true because the intiial exposure was still problematic which was taken into account in the empirics
* People exposed quickly were much more likely to do both active and passive cheating. It has that empirical warrant + an analytical warrant that people without believing in free will don’t feel responsible for their actions (which is also empirically justified as a separate claim here)
* The card also says that even if free will is an illusion, there still is significant value in using that because otheriwse it leads to bad stuff like cheating – can go for this as a sort of pragmatism-y arg in the 2ar even if they win determinsim is substantively true

**The belief that one determines one’s own outcomes is strong and pervasive**. In a massive survey of people in 36 countries, **more than 70% agreed with the statement that their fate is in their own hands** (International Social Survey Programme, 1998). Yet the view from the scientific community is that behavior is caused by genes underlying personality dispositions, brain mechanisms, or features of the environment (e.g., Bargh, in press; Crick, 1994; Pinker, 2002). There is reason to think that **scientists’ sentiment is spreading to nonscientists.** For example, the news magazine The Economist recently ran the headline, ‘‘Free to Choose? Modern Neuroscience Is Eroding the Idea of Free Will’’ (‘‘Free to Choose?’’ 2006). **What would happen if people came to believe that their behavior is the inexorable product of a causal chain set into motion without their own volition? Would people carry on, selves and behavior unperturbed, or, as Sartre suggested, might the adoption of a deterministic worldview serve as an excuse for untoward behaviors?** **It is** well established **that changing people’s sense of responsibility can change their behavior.** For example, **invoking** a sense of **personal accountability causes people to modify their behavior to better align with their attitudes** (Harmon-Jones & Mills, 1999). **Believing that outcomes are based on an inborn trait, rather than effort, also influences behavior**. For instance, Mueller and Dweck (1998) observed **10-year-old children who were told that they had been successful on an initial task either as the result of their intelligence or through their hard work. In a second round, all the children encountered a task that was well beyond their performance level (i.e., they failed at it**). **When the children were given yet a third task, those who thought their earlier success was due to their intelligence put forth less effort and reported lower enjoyment than those who thought their initial success was due to their own effort.** The authors concluded that the former children’s belief that their performance was linked to their intelligence indicated to them that achieving a high score on the difficult problems in the second round was beyond their ability. Hence, **faring poorly (on an admittedly difficult task) indicated to children in the intelligence condition that they were simply not smart enough for the task, which in turn led them to stop trying to perform well and to like the task less**. If **reducing people’s sense of control also reduces the amount of effort they put toward improving their performance, then advocating a deterministic worldview that dismisses individual causation may similarly promote undesirable behavior.** In this vein, Peale (1989) bemoaned how quickly and consistently deviant behavior is tagged a ‘‘disease,’’ a label that obviates personal responsibility for its occurrence. As a recent Washington Post article on neuroscience and moral behavior put it succinctly, ‘‘**Reducing morality and immorality to brain chemistry—rather than free will—might diminish the importance of personal responsibility**’’ (Vedantam, 2007, p. A01). Although some people have speculated about the societal risks that might result from adopting a viewpoint that denies personal responsibility for actions, **this hypothesis has not been explored empirically**. **In the two experiments reported here, we manipulated beliefs related to free will and measured their influence on morality as manifested in cheating behavior**. **We hypothesized that participants induced to believe that human behavior is under the control of predetermined forces would cheat more than would participants not led to believe that behavior is predetermined.** Our experimental results supported this hypothesis**.** EXPERIMENT 1 Method Participants Participants were 30 undergraduates (13 females, 17 males). Procedure Participants came to the lab individually. First, according to the condition to which they were randomly assigned, they read one of two passages from The Astonishing Hypothesis, a book written by Francis Crick (1994), the Nobel-prize-winning scientist. In the anti-free-will condition, participants read statements claiming that rational, high-minded people—including, according to Crick, most scientists—now recognize that actual free will is an illusion, and also claiming that the idea of free will is a side effect of the architecture of the mind. In the control condition, participants read a passage from a chapter on consciousness, which did not discuss free will. After reading their assigned material, participants completed the Free Will and Determinism scale (FWD; Paulhus & Margesson, 1994) and the Positive and Negative Affectivity Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), which we used to assess whether the reading manipulation affected their beliefs and mood. Subsequently, participants were given a computer-based mental-arithmetic task (von Hippel, Lakin, & Shakarchi, 2005) in which they were asked to calculate the answers to 20 problems (e.g., 1 1 8 1 18 12 1 19 7 1 17 2 1 8 4 5 ?), presented individually. They were told that the computer had a programming glitch and the correct answer would appear on the screen while they were attempting to solve each problem, but that they could stop the answer from being displayed by pressing the space bar after the problem appeared. Furthermore, participants were told that although the experimenter would not know whether they had pressed the space bar, they should try to solve the problems honestly, on their own. In actuality, the computer had been rigged not only to show the answers, but also to record the number of space-bar presses. The dependent measure of cheating was the number of times participants pressed the space bar to prevent the answer from appearing. Afterward, participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation. Results Scores on the FWD Scale We first checked to see whether participants’ beliefs about free will were affected by the excerpts they read (anti-free-will vs. control condition). As expected, scores on the Free Will subscale of the FWD scale showed that participants in the anti-freewill condition reported weaker free-will beliefs (M 5 13.6, SD 5 2.66) than participants in the control condition (M 5 16.8, SD 5 2.67), t(28) 5 3.28, p < .01. Scores on the other three subscales of the FWD scale (Fate, Scientific Causation, and Chance) did not differ as a function of condition, ts < 1. Cheating We first recoded the dependent measure by subtracting the number of space-bar presses from 20, so that higher scores indicated more cheating. Analysis of the main dependent measure, degree of cheating, revealed that, as predicted, participants cheated more frequently after reading the anti-free-will essay (M 5 14.00, SD 5 4.17) than after reading the control essay (M 5 9.67, SD 5 5.58), t(28) 5 3.04, p < .01. Does Rejecting the Idea of Free Will Lead to Cheating? To test our hypothesis that cheating would increase after participants were persuaded that free will does not exist, we first calculated the correlation between scores on the Free Will subscale and cheating behavior. As expected, we found a strong negative relationship, r(30) 5 .53, such that weaker endorsement of the notion that personal behavior is determined by one’s own will was associated with more instances of cheating. We next performed a mediation analysis to test our prediction that degree of belief in free will would determine degree of cheating. Using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), we found support for this hypothesis: When Free Will subscale scores were entered as a predictor of cheating alongside experimental condition, the effect of condition failed to predict cheating, F < 1, whereas the effect of free-will beliefs remained significant, F(1, 27) 5 7.81, p < .01. Ancillary Measure: Mood To ensure that the essays did not inadvertently alter participants’ moods, we assessed positive and negative emotions using the PANAS. Mood did not differ between conditions, ts < 1.35, ps > .19 EXPERIMENT 2 In Experiment 1, participants cheated more frequently on a simple arithmetic task after reading an essay that refuted the notion of free will than after reading a neutral essay. Moreover, reading the anti-free-will essay reduced participants’ belief in free will, a change that accounted for the impact of the essay on cheating behavior. Although the evidence in Experiment 1 is strong statistically, the way in which cheating was operationalized clouds interpretation of the results. Recall that cheating behavior was measured by the number of instances in which participants allowed answers to math questions to appear when they were supposed to be calculating the answers mentally. Although this is a well-validated method of assessing cheating (von Hippel et al., 2005), note that simply doing nothing is coded as cheating. Hence, the anti-free-will essay may have induced passivity generally, rather than immoral behavior specifically. Although participants were instructed to press the space bar to avoid receiving the answers, their failure to do so—counted as cheating—may not have been deliberately unethical. Experiment 2 addressed this limitation by using a task that required active behavior in order to cheat (Mazar, Amir, & Ariely, 2007) and that made clear the moral ramifications of an infraction. We also included a condition intended to strengthen free-will beliefs so that we could systematically test our hypothesis about the relation between strength of free-will beliefs and moral behavior. Finally, to bolster confidence in the interpretation of our results, we added conditions in which we obtained participants’ scores on the task when they could not cheat. Method Participants Participants were 122 undergraduates (46 females, 75 males, 1 participant who did not specify gender). Data from 3 participants were unusable: One participant was a friend of the experimenter, and in two cases in which participants had the opportunity to cheat, only 1 person arrived at the experiment, which meant that a sense of anonymity was absent (see the next paragraph). Procedure Participants were randomly assigned to one of five conditions, in three of which cheating was possible. In the cheating-possible conditions (namely, the free-will, determinism, and neutral conditions), participants arrived at the laboratory in groups of 2 to 5, but were immediately shown to individual carrels, where they performed all tasks individually. This arrangement promoted a sense of anonymity, which was relevant for the cheating opportunity. In the two noncheating conditions, participants reported to the laboratory individually and were not given an opportunity to cheat. In the cheating-possible conditions, participants first completed a task, similar to one used by Velten (1968), that involved reading and considering a series of statements meant to change beliefs or feelings. Participants were given a booklet of 15 statements (1 per page) and were asked to think about each statement for 1 min before turning the page. A tape-recorded voice indicated when to turn the page. Belief in free will was manipulated by varying the content of the statements. In the free-will condition, participants read statements such as, ‘‘I am able to override the genetic and environmental factors that sometimes influence my behavior,’’ and ‘‘Avoiding temptation requires that I exert my free will.’’ In the determinism condition, participants read statements such as, ‘‘A belief in free will contradicts the known fact that the universe is governed by lawful principles of science,’’ and ‘‘Ultimately, we are biological computers—designed by evolution, built through genetics, and programmed by the environment.’’ In the neutral condition, participants read statements such as, ‘‘Sugar cane and sugar beets are grown in 112 countries.’’ The neutral statements came from Velten’s (1968) original method, whereas we created the free-will and determinism statements. After participants read and pondered all of the statements, they completed the FWD scale (Paulhus & Margesson, 1994) and the PANAS (Watson et al., 1988). We then orchestrated an opportunity to cheat (e.g., Mazar et al., 2007). Participants were given a set of 15 readingcomprehension, mathematical, and logic and reasoning problems taken from the Graduate Record Examination practice tests. This type of task has been used previously to present subjects with a challenging but solvable set of problems (Schmeichel, Vohs, & Baumeister, 2003). Participants were told that the experimenter was investigating people’s enjoyment of tasks when they receive feedback and rewards for performance, and hence that they would receive $1 for each problem they solved correctly. At this point, the experimenter looked at her cellular telephone and announced that she had suddenly realized she had a meeting to attend. She indicated that participants should work for a maximum of 15 min, and then score their own problems and pay themselves $1 for each correct answer. The experimenter motioned to several answer sheets and a manila envelope containing $1 coins. She told participants to use the mechanical shredder to shred their answer sheets because she did not have permission to keep the sheets. The experimenter left the room but waited outside to debrief participants as they exited. Although this procedure did not allow us to determine individual participants’ scores on the task or the amount of money each participant paid him- or herself, we were able to calculate the average payment per participant, and this average served as a proxy for each participant’s number of correct answers. Two comparison conditions, labeled baseline experimenterscored and determinism experimenter-scored, enabled us to measure veridically the number of questions that participants answered correctly (i.e., when participants were not in the self-scoring, self-payment situation). In the baseline experimenter-scored condition, participants simply completed the cognitive problems, which the experimenter scored; participants then received $1 for each correct answer. We did not ask participants in this condition to complete the FWD scale so as not to activate the concept of free will. In the determinism experimenter-scored condition, we gave participants the determinism statements and then the logic problems. The experimenter scored the problems and paid participants $1 for each correct answer. This comparison condition allowed us to assess whether reading the scientific-sounding determinism statements had the incidental effect of aiding in solving the logic problems. Thus, there were three comparison conditions we could use to examine the effects of the determinism and free-will manipulations on cheating: a neutral condition, in which participants were allowed to cheat but were not exposed to statements that might change their beliefs about free will; a baseline experimenter-scored condition, in which participants’ true scores on the cognitive task were calculated without any manipulation; and a determinism experimenter-scored condition, in which participants read deterministic statements but were not allowed to cheat, so that their true scores on the problem set were known. Results Scores on the FWD Scale Participants in the free-will, determinism, and neutral conditions completed the FWD scale so that we could check whether the manipulations in the statement-reading task had been effective. Scores on the Free Will subscale differed as a function of condition, F(2, 70) 5 17.03, p < .01. A planned contrast revealed that participants in the free-will condition reported stronger beliefs in free will (M 5 23.09, SD 5 6.42) than did participants in the neutral condition (M 5 20.04, SD 5 3.76), t(70) 5 12.54, p < .01. A second planned contrast showed that participants in the determinism condition reported weaker beliefs in free will (M 5 15.56, SD 5 2.79) than did participants in the neutral condition, t(70) 5 3.52, p < .01. The manipulations also affected endorsement of statements on the Scientific Causation subscale, F(2, 70) 5 5.85, p < .01. Specific contrasts showed that participants in the determinism condition had higher scores (M 5 23.14, SD 5 2.69) than those in the neutral and free-will conditions (neutral: M 5 20.40, SD 5 3.40; free will: M 5 20.78, SD 5 3.21), t(70) 5 2.98, p < .01. Scores on the Fate and Chance subscales were unaffected by the manipulations, Fs < 0.2, ps > .30. Assessment of Cheating Behavior In three conditions, participants paid themselves after scoring (and shredding) their own answer sheets, whereas in two additional conditions, the experimenter paid participants according to their actual performance. Hence, to assess cheating behavior, we compared payments in the self-paid, cheating-possible groups with payments in the experimenter-scored groups. Recall that we did not have participants’ answer sheets in the three selfpaid conditions; therefore, we divided the number of $1 coins taken by each group by the number of group members to arrive at an average self-payment. These group averages, along with the known payments in the baseline experimenter-scored and determinism experimenter-scored conditions, were subjected to an analysis of variance, which showed a significant effect of condition, F(4, 114) 5 5.68, p < .01. Planned contrasts revealed that participants who had read the determinism statements and who were allowed to pay themselves for correct answers walked away with more money than the others, t(114) 5 4.48, p < .01 (see Fig. 1). None of the other groups differed from each other, ts < 1. Did Changing Beliefs About Free Will Change Cheating Behavior? **To test our hypothesis that discouraging a belief in free will would lead to cheating, we first calculated the correlation between scores on the Free Will subscale and average payments. As expected, we found a strong negative relationship**, r(71) 5 .47,1 **indicating that the more participants endorsed statements of free will, the less they paid themselves (on average) for the self-scored cognitive test**. Next, we performed a mediation analysis to assess our prediction that free-will beliefs determine cheating. In an ANCOVA in which Free Will scores and condition were entered as predictors of cheating, the effect of condition failed to predict cheating behavior, F < 1, whereas **the effect of free-will beliefs remained significant**, t(67) 5 10.72, p < .01. Ancillary Measure: Mood To ensure that the statements did not inadvertently alter participants’ moods, we assessed positive and negative emotions using the PANAS. There were no differences as a function of condition, Fs < 1. GENERAL DISCUSSION In **two experiments, we found that weakening free-will beliefs** reliably **increased cheating**. **We measured cheating in Experiment 1 using a passive cheating opportunity.** To avoid cheating, participants had to actively prevent the answer to an arithmetic problem from appearing on the computer screen. This scenario is perhaps akin to accidentally receiving too much change from a store clerk but not returning the extra money. **In Experiment 2, we measured active cheating. We found that when participants were allowed to pay themselves for each correct answer on a difficult cognitive test, those who read statements promoting a deterministic worldview paid themselves more** (in effect, claimed to have answered more items correctly) than did those who read other kinds of statements; **moreover, participants who read deterministic statements and who paid themselves gave themselves more money than was earned by participants who were paid for their true performance.** One limitation of Experiment 2 is that we did not measure the amount of money that each individual took, but rather assessed the total amount of money taken by each group overall. However, **this** aspect of the procedure **had the advantage of allowing participants in the cheating-possible conditions to not only score but also shred their own tests**, which was crucial to **establishing the anonymity necessary to measure active cheating in the lab**. It is possible that only 1 or 2 participants in each group cheated, and that the remainder took their fair share of money (or less). With this procedure, we cannot be sure**. What we do know is that the average take-home pay was far greater for participants in the determinism condition than for participants in any of the other four conditions, including two additional conditions in which participants scored and shredded their own tests.** Note, too, that **participants who read deterministic statements claimed to have solved more problems correctly than participants who read the same deterministic statements but whose true scores on the logic task were known**. The fact that brief exposure to a message **asserting that there is no such thing as free will can increase both passive and active cheating raises the concern that** advocating **a deterministic worldview** could undermine moral behavior**.** The data from the experiments reported here are consistent with this hypothesis. **Reading deterministic statements decreased people’s selfreported belief in free will, and this change accounted for heightened cheating**. Although **people appear to have a tacit, default belief in free will** (as evidenced both by participants’ default responses on the Free Will subscale and by the lack of a difference in cheating behavior between the free-will and neutral conditions in Experiment 2), **participants’ views on this topic were in fact quite pliable**. **Indeed, brief exposure to messages arguing against free will was sufficient to alter participants’ views** (and consequent actions). **The present findings raise the genuine concern that widespread encouragement of a deterministic worldview may have the inadvertent consequence of encouraging cheating behavior**. Consistent with this view are recent trends suggesting both a decrease in beliefs in personal control and an increase in cheating. A recent meta-analysis that took into account cohort effects (Twenge, Zhange, & Im, 2004) revealed substantial changes in Locus of Control scores from the 1960s to the 1990s. The Locus of Control scale (Rotter, 1966) assesses lay beliefs about whether internal (personal) or external (situational) factors are responsible for one’s outcomes in life (Rotter, 1966). **People’s belief that they do not control their own outcomes (external locus of control) jumped more than three quarters of a standard deviation over the decades Twenge et al. studied**. With respect to cheating, reports from the academic realm indicate that levels of cheating have increased recently. One scientist who has been tracking cheating across several decades has found that self-reports of cheating have increased (Schab, 1991). The percentage of students who admitted that they had used a ‘‘cheat sheet’’ on an exam rose from 34% in 1969 to 68% in 1989. Other types of cheating have risen as well (e.g., allowing other students to copy work and lifting statements from printed material; Schab, 1991). There are numerous reasons why selfreported cheating might have increased in recent years. However, the concurrent decrease in belief in an internal locus of control, in combination with our findings, raises the ominous possibility that reduced belief in free will may contribute to an increase in cheating. Although the study reported here raises concerns about the possible impact of deterministic views on moral behavior, it is important not to overinterpret our findings. Our experiments measured only modest forms of ethical behavior, and whether or not free-will beliefs have the same effect on more significant moral and ethical infractions is unknown. In addition, a deterministic viewpoint may have a host of possible consequences, and only some of these may be unfavorable. For example, adopting the view that behavior is a consequence of environmental and genetic factors could encourage compassion for the mentally ill and discourage retribution in legal contexts (Greene & Cohen, 2004). A deterministic outlook may also enhance people’s sensitivity to the subtle influences known to affect their goals and actions (Bargh, in press). It is also crucial to emphasize that the findings reported here do not speak to the larger issue of whether free will actually exists**. It is possible that free will is an illusion that nevertheless offers some functionality**. It may be that a necessary cost of public awareness regarding the science of human behavior will be the dampening of certain beliefs about personal agency (Wegner, 2002). Conversely, it may prove possible to integrate a genuine sense of free will into scientific accounts of human behavior (see Baumeister, in press; Dennett, 2003; Kane, 1996; Shariff, Schooler, & Vohs, in press). Although the concept of free will remains scientifically in question, **our results point to** a significant value **in believing that free will exists.** **If exposure to deterministic messages increases the likelihood of unethical actions, then identifying approaches for insulating the public against this danger becomes** imperative. Ultimately, in order to oppose the unfavorable consequences of deterministic sentiments, **the field must first develop a deeper understanding of why dismissing free will leads to amoral behavior. Does the belief that forces outside the self determine behavior drain the motivation to resist the temptation to cheat, inducing a ‘‘why bother?’’ mentality** (cf. Baumeister & Vohs, 2007)? **Much as thoughts of death and meaninglessness can induce existential angst that can lead to ignoble behaviors** (e.g., Arndt, Greenberg, & Solomon, 1997; Heine, Proulx, & Vohs, 2006), **doubting one’s free will may** undermine the sense of self as agent**. Or, perhaps, denying free will simply provides** the ultimate excuse to behave as one likes**.**

#### Voting issue – A] accessibility – people can justify their repugnant actions – pushes people out who have experienced past violence and allows people to justify future violence –judges have an obligation to make sure people don’t feel unsafe B] cheating – the judge’s a priori obligation as an educator is to prevent actions that encourage cheating – outweighs on proximity.
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### Framework

#### The meta-ethic is practical reason.

#### A] Bindingness – Any obligation must not only tell us what is good, but why we ought to be good or else agents can reject the value of goodness itself. That means ethics must start with what is constitutive of agents since it traces obligations to features that are intrinsic to being an agent – as an agent you must follow certain rules. Only practical agency is constitutive since agents can use rationality to decide against other values but the act of deciding to reject practical agency engages in it.

#### B] Action theory – every moral analysis requires an action to evaluate, but actions are infinitely divisible into smaller meaningless movements. The act of stealing can be reduced to going to a house, entering, grabbing things, and leaving, all of which are distinct actions without moral value. Only the practical decision to steal ties these actions together to give them any moral value.

#### That justifies universalizability.

#### A] The principle of equality is true since anything else assigns moral value to contingent factors like identity and justifies racism, and the principle of non-contradiction is true since 2+2 can’t equal 4 for me and not for you meaning ethical statements true for one must be true for all.

#### B] Is ought gap – experience only tells us what is since that’s what we perceive, not what ought to be. But it’s impossible to derive an ought from descriptive premises, so there needs to be additional a priori premises to make a moral theory. Applying reason to a priori truth results in universal obligations.

#### Coercion isn’t universalizable—willing your own freedom while violating someone else’s is a conceptual contradiction.

Engstrom [Stephen Engstrom, (Professor of Philosophy @ the University of Pittsburgh) "Universal Legislation as the Form of Practical Knowledge" http://www.academia.edu/4512762/Universal\_Legislation\_As\_the\_Form\_of\_Practical\_Knowledge, DOA:5-5-2018 // WWBW]

Given the preceding considerations, it’s a straightforward matter to see how **a maxim of action that assaults the freedom of others** with a view to furthering one’s own ends results in a contradiction when we attempt to will it as a universal law in accordance with the foregoing account of the formula of universal law. Such a maxim **would lie in a practical judgment that deems it good on the whole to act to limit others’ outer freedom**, and hence their self-sufficiency, their capacity to realize their ends, **where doing so augments, or extends, one’s own outer freedom** and so also one’s own self-sufficiency.  Now on the interpretation we’ve been entertaining, applying the formula of universal law involves considering whether it’s possible for every person—every subject capable of practical judgment—to share the practical judgment asserting the goodness of every person’s acting according to the maxim in question. Thus in the present case the application of the formula involves considering whether it’s possible for every person to deem good every person’s acting to limit others’ freedom, where practicable, with a view to augmenting their own freedom. Since here **all persons are** on the one hand **deeming good both the limitation of others’ freedom and the extension of their own freedom, while** on the other hand, insofar as they agree with the similar judgments of others, **also deeming good the limitation of their own freedom and the extension of others’ freedom, they are all deeming good both the extension and the limitation of both their own and others’ freedom. These judgments are inconsistent** insofar as the extension of a person’s outer freedom is incompatible with the limitation of that same freedom.

#### This requires a system of property – mere empirical possession is insufficient and contrary to freedom, Hogdson 10:

Louis Philippe Hogdson, 2010, “Kant on Property Rights and the State” <http://www.yorku.ca/lhodgson/kant-on-property-rights-and.pdf> //LHP AV

What does it mean to say that property rights are essential for freedom? For our purposes, the crucial feature of **property is the possibility of rightfully excluding others from the use of a certain object.**8 If I own a certain apple, then that means that you wrong me if you use the apple without my permission, and hence that you can forcibly be prevented from doing so. Importantly, this is the case **regardless of whether I am physically holding the apple or not.**9 The point is worth stressing. **I can exclude you from using an apple simply by holding it. I then exclude you physically**, since we cannot both hold the apple at the same time; **I also exclude you normatively, since using force** to wrestle the apple from me **would violate my right to freedom** (assuming that you have no property right in the apple).10 **Still**, **this** form of exclusion falls short of what is required for genuine property, because it **makes my right** to the apple **entirely derivative from my right to bodily integrity**, and hence leaves me with no complaint if I accidentally drop the apple and you pick it up. **Genuine property rights do not depend on physical possession** in that way: if an apple is genuinely mine and I drop it, then you wrong me if you pick it up and walk away with it; that I was not physically holding the apple at the time is irrelevant.11 **The question we need to ask, then, is why freedom demands that it be possible for me to exclude others from using certain objects even though I am not in physical possession** of them. How can freedom place such demands with respect to objects that are external to me – objects that are neither physically connected to my body, nor essentially connected to me in the way my body is**? Kant’s answer has two parts**. **First**, he tells us that the possibility of **property is the** object of the **postulate of private right**: It is possible for me to have any external object of my choice as mine, that is, **a maxim by which**, if it were to become a law, **an object** of choice **would** in itself (objectively) have to **belong to no one** (res nullius) **is contrary to right**.12 Second, he explains the necessity of this postulate as follows: **an object of my choice is something that I have the physical power to** **use**. **If it were** nevertheless absolutely **not within my rightful power to** make **use** of **it**, that is, if the use of it could not coexist with the freedom of everyone in accordance with a universal law (**would be wrong**), **then freedom would be depriving itself of the use of its choice with regard to an object of choice, by putting usable objects beyond any possibility of being used**; in other words, **it would annihilate them in a practical respect** and make them into a res nullius, even though in the use of things choice was formally consistent with everyone’s outer freedom in accordance with universal laws.13 The problem is that this seems to get things precisely backwards. Kant stresses that external freedom demands that the use of some objects be rightful. That seems obvious enough: **there would be no external freedom to speak of if the external world were entirely off limits**. But that hardly establishes a link between freedom and property in the stronger sense that concerns us here. Kant explains why it is not possible for every object to be off limits to all; the question we need to ask is how it is possible for any object that I am not physically holding to be off limits to others. The difficulty I am pointing to can be brought out by considering an alternative to a system of property: a system of mere empirical possession in which everything in the world can rightfully be used, so long as it is not under someone’s physical control. In this system, the ground on which I stand and the objects I carry around with me are off limits to you, but the rest of the world – including objects I put down or dropped a moment ago – is up for grabs. Such a system does not put ‘usable objects beyond any possibility of being used’ in any straightforward sense. Yet, if Kant believes that freedom demands the possibility of full-fledged property rights, he must think that a system of empirical possession unjustifiably restricts freedom. How is that the case? **The problem, in a nutshell, is that a system of empirical possession only allows me to pursue projects taking place within the space I occupy at a given moment and involving objects that I can hold for the entire duration of the project**. Any other project – and this means any remotely complex project – will involve objects whose use I cannot rightfully determine through my choices, and for whose use I am therefore inevitably dependent on the choices of others. Put differently, a system of mere empirical possession makes my (eminently restricted) ability to occupy space and to hold objects the measure of my ability to make objects into my means, and thus to set and pursue ends for myself. This unjustifiably restricts my external freedom, because there is no reason why my having only two hands (to name only one obvious physical limitation) should determine what means I can rightfully secure for myself. To illustrate the point, **suppose that I want to build** myself **a house**. Suppose that one of the means **I need** to pursue this project is **a hammer**, and that I happen to find just the hammer I need. The problem that a system of **mere empirical possession** poses is not that it makes the hammer off limits to me, as Kant seems to suggest in the passage I quoted above, but, rather, that it **makes** **my right to stop you from taking the hammer contingent on my ability to hold on to it**. As soon as I put it down for a second, you are perfectly entitled to pick it up and walk away with it. Worse, once you have grabbed the hammer, it is yours in the sense appropriate to the system, and I cannot rightfully take it back so long as you are holding it. The same holds for the land on which I plan to build my house: my right to exclude others from it only extends to the ground on which I am standing at a given time. You are perfectly entitled to move around on the rest of the land I intend to use, regardless of whether I have fenced it off or started building on it. Indeed, if you decide to stand on part of the land that I claim, you make it off limits to me, and thereby make it impossible for me to realize my project without wronging you. **That I would be wronging you is important here: it shows how your interference differs from other unforeseen circumstances** I may face in pursuing my project. An earthquake could destroy most of what I have built, and thereby hamper my pursuit far more than you would by grabbing the hammer. But the earthquake does not raise normative problems for how I may pursue my end. If it destroys my house, then I can just rebuild it; indeed, if I have the means, I am justified in stopping the earthquake from happening altogether. In this way, the earthquake only presents me with an instrumental problem: it requires me to revise my calculations for how I am to achieve my goal. Interference of that kind does not restrict my ability to set and pursue ends; it is simply part of what exercising that ability involves for a finite being. Your interference raises a different problem. As **a rational agent, you are not just some circumstance that I have to work around: your right to freedom means that you can make things off limits** to me simply by holding on to them. If you choose to stand on the ground where I intended to build, you thereby put a stop to my project of building a house there; if you choose to pick up an object I left lying around, you make it impossible for me to use it for my project. **All a system of mere empirical possession allows me to do to avoid such occurrences is to plead with you** not to interfere with my project. In other words, on such a system, it is always partly up to you whether I can rightfully make use of an object that I am not currently holding, or of a piece of land on which I am not currently standing. The only means I can have at my disposal to set and pursue my ends with are objects to which I am physically connected. As I said above, **this** makes my limited ability to hold objects the measure of what means I can have at my disposal, **which arbitrarily restricts my ability to set and pursue ends** for myself.14 Now on Kant’s view, as I said at the outset, such a restriction can be justified, but only if it is required by freedom. In our case, this means that **the restriction imposed by the system of mere empirical possession is acceptable only if my having a full-fledged property right in the hammer** – that is, my being allowed to stop you from using it even when I am not holding it – **would somehow be incompatible with your freedom**. We can easily show that this is not the case. One way to make the point is to stress that **your freedom depends on your ability to set and pursue ends** for yourself, **which does not depend on** your access to **any particular object**; **therefore, I do not restrict your freedom** by making the hammer off limits to you.15 There is also a more direct way to make the point in the present context. One can simply note that, **from the point of view of you**r access to the hammer, **there is no relevant difference between** a system of **full**-fledged **property** rights **and** a system of mere **empirical possession**, since both systems allow me to exclude you entirely from using the hammer. Of course, on the latter system, I can do so only by physically holding on to the hammer for the rest of my life, whereas the former system allows me to set the hammer down while still excluding you. But **from your standpoint the two scenarios amount to the same thing, since what matters is simply that I exclude you** from using the hammer, not how I do it. A full-fledged system of property thus brings about no further restriction on your freedom. **Consequently, any restriction of freedom associated with a system of mere empirical possession cannot be grounded in the need to protect freedom itself and hence must be unjustified on Kant’s view**. Let me close this section by stressing the general character of the conclusion we have reached. We have seen that **freedom requires property**. This is not to say that freedom requires the specific form of private property found in modern capitalist societies. Kant’s argument only requires some system of rights allowing one to exclude others from using a certain object for a certain amount of time, regardless of whether one is holding it or not. That could be achieved by a system under which the means of production are communally owned, so long as it appropriately determines who has the right to use a given object at a given time.16 The considerations presented here thus do not amount to an endorsement of capitalism, or of the sort of absolute private property rights advocated by libertarians.17 They support a broader thesis: that, **if rational agents are to live together without undermining one another’s freedom, then they must have a system that allows them to control certain objects through their choices without having to hold on to them physically**. Nothing more is required for the rest of our argument. objects through their choices without having to hold on to them physically. Nothing more is required for the rest of our argument.

#### However, we are rational and impulsive – this nonideal situation requires a state with coercive authority that secures equal outer freedom and property, Koch 92 bracketed for glang:

\*bracketed for gendered language\* Koch, Andrew M. "Immanuel Kant, The Right of Necessity, and the Liberal Foundation of Social Welfare" Southeastern Political Review, 20: 2 (Fall 1992) 295-314. <https://libres.uncg.edu/ir/asu/f/koch_andrew_1992_Immanuel_Kant.pdf> //LHP AV DOA: 9/14/21

Immanuel Kant, Ontology, Morality, and the Law The discussion of "necessity" in the writings of Immanuel Kant takes place within a broad context, linking the Kantian epistemology, ontology, and claims regarding civil society. **The ontology of** Immanuel Kant asserts that **the human** being **is both phenomenal**, part of the physical world of experience, **and noumenal**, part of the "realm of the mind." (Kant 1977b, 196-198) **As a part of the physical environment a person is subject to all the laws which govern** the interaction of **objects** in physical space. **However, Kant suggested** the possibility **that the individual, having** the power of transcendental **reason**, has the capacity for thought which is independent of the deterministic features of the phenomenal world. This seemingly abstract philosophic notion is very significant with respect to Kant's claim about the possibility of freedom and morality. If the power of the will operates in a realm outside the determinism of the phenomenal world then the freedom of the will to direct the body's actions may be assumed. If there is an undetermined element in the make-up of the human being, said Kant, the individual "may" be provided with the possibility of autonomous action. Here it should be noted that Kant does not claim he can "prove" the autonomy of the will, only that the possibility for it exists. He does, however, assert emphatically that, "...**the principle of autonomy is the sole principle of morals**." (Kant 1977b, 188) Kant argues that without freedom no moral accountability is possible. If individuals do not choose their actions they cannot be held morally accountable for those actions. **When a person is not free to do otherwise, that person bears no responsibility for the outcome of an act**. So while freedom of the will cannot be proven within the Kantian scheme, it must be assumed if morality is to have any meaning. **For Kant, the interaction of individuals creates problems. If human beings are truly free, the social environment in which they pursue their happiness will generate "antagonisms."** (Kant 1977c, 429) As both reason and impulse, **selfish egoism would reign unchecked should some mechanism to control the impulsive side** of the human character **not be present.** Kant concluded that in society man is in need of a "master." (Kant 1977a, 122**) The aggression and selfishness in human nature can be mitigated if reason is used to keep impulse under control.** (Kant 1977a, 119) **Reason allows for the creation of an external body of rule which can serve to regulate social interaction**. **This regulation of freedom is designed to produce the maximum amount of freedom that can be shared by all**. (Kant 1977a, 121) Kant indicated that he did not believe every problem could be solved by creating laws. **No matter how perfect a system of laws, the perfectibility of the human being is still in doubt.** As Kant stated, "...a complete solution is impossible. One cannot fashion something absolutely straight from wood which is as crooked as that of which man is made." (Kant 1977a, 123) **The best that one can hope for is an approximate** solution. That consists of creating an external body of laws that will regulate the behavior of individuals in their social interactions. Here Kant is making a very specific claim regarding the role of law in civil society. **Freedom of interaction is to be maximized for everyone equally. The role of the law is to deter those who would subvert the attainment of a common level of freedom for all**. The use of force, that is organized and legitimated as the externalization of human reason, **serves a deterrent function in society**. Those that would inhibit the freedom of others would be, according to Kant, deterred by the threat of punishment. **Law, and the collective force that it represents, checks the impulsive and egoistic elements in human nature. Only when the natural antagonisms among people are checked can [hu]mankind reach its fullest potential**. **A functioning set of laws designed to regulate human intercourse is essential to civil society**. The collection of those laws Kant referred to as a "civil constitution." Kant stated that **joining into civil society is the first duty of those who cannot avoid having mutual influence on one another**. (Kant 1977c, 415) **A union of people in a commonwealth involves the externalization of duties into a formal set of standards based on the principle of freedom.** (Kant 1977c, 415) Kant is emphatic with regard to the standard that is to govern the conduct of individuals in civil society. Kant declared that **people should always act to treat others as "ends"** not merely as means**. Thus Kant has linked the idea of personal obligation and morality to the formulation of law in civil society**. In Part I of The Metaphysics of Morals, a section entitled The Metaphysical Elements of Justice, Kant explored this further by asserting what he called the "Universal Principle of Justice." Every action is just if its maxim is such that the freedom of the will of each can coexist with the freedom of everyone....(Kant 1965, 35) This statement contains a variety of elements relevant to the notion of freedom in Kant's moral and political philosophy. The primary characteristic of justice is the maintenance of freedom in social intercourse. It is also important to note that Kant makes no reference to the content of interaction or of its goals. **In fact, he specifically states that the content of social interaction is not the specific concern of justice**. "[T]he content of justice does not take into consideration the matter of the content of the will . . . " (Kant 1965, 34) **Only the form of interaction is relevant for Kant. Relations must be such that the participants share a common and equal level of freedom in the conduct of their affairs**. **Rights** and duties within the state ultimately **derive from the principle of freedom**. (Kant 1977c, 415) **The state has the role of both legal adjudicator and coercive apparatus in the maintenance of freedom**. The strategy of civil society is to create an external set of duties, "publiccoercive law," in which every person's rights are secured against interference from any other person in the society. (Kant 1977c, 415) The state, said Kant, "is a union of men under juridical laws." (Kant 1935, 182) **The state, as a collection of laws, is a legitimate instrument of coercion if it uses its power for the maintenance of the maximum level of freedom that all the members of society can share**. (Kant 1965, 36-39) The state's system of justice, positive law, emerges in order to protect each citizen from the natural antagonisms that arise as individuals seek to maximize their happiness in the social environment. (Kant 1977c, 416-417) **The state has both the obligation and the force to compel compliance to** the laws which **protect the freedom** of all.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with a system of equal and outer freedoms.

#### Impact calc – reject consequentialism

#### 1] Culpability – actors can only be culpable for their rational decision, not the outcomes. Anything else means actors have no control over the morality of decisions meaning it is impossible for them to be obligated to act.

#### 2] Consequences are infinite – opening a door could one day cause nuke war through an endless chain or shooting someone may end up saving lives – unpredictability means they are not a stable basis for ethics which freezes action since agents never know what action to take

#### 3] Aggregation fails – there is no one for whom aggregate good is good-for. Korsgaard:

Christine Korsgaard, “The Origin of the Good and Our Animal Nature” Harvard, n.d. RE

According to the second view I will consider, hedonism, the good just is pleasurable experience or consciousness and the absence of painful experience or consciousness. What makes a being capable of having a final good is simply that the being is conscious. Otherwise, its good is not relative to its nature. As is often noticed, on this theory it is a real question whether some of the other animals might not have a better life, or at least be capable of having a better life, than human beings, given their apparent enthusiasm for simple and readily available joys. Although I’ll treat it as a separate theory, hedonism, I believe, has an inherent tendency to collapse either into a version of the intrinsic value theory, or into a version of the third view I am about to describe. Obviously, it is possible to regard hedonism simply as a particular instance of the intrinsic value theory, one that singles out conscious experience as the only possible bearer of intrinsic value. But I think this way of looking at hedonism does not do justice to the intuition that has made hedonism seem plausible to so many thinkers, which is precisely the idea that the final good must have an irreducibly subjective or relational element. That is, what makes hedonism seem plausible is precisely the idea that the final good for a sensate being must be something that can be felt or experienced as a good by that being. It is something that can be perceived or experienced as welcome or positive from the being’s own point of view, and that is therefore relative to the being’s own point of view.9 The intrinsic value version of hedonism tries to capture the essentially subjective element of the final good by attaching objective intrinsic value to a subjective experience, but when this move is made the essentially relational or relative character of subjectivity tends to drop out. The goodness of the experience is detached from its goodness for the being who is having the experience, and instead is located in the character of the experience itself. This defect shows up most clearly in utilitarian versions of hedonism, which allow us to add the goodness of pleasant experiences across the boundaries between persons or between animals. There is no subject for whom the total of these aggregated experiences is a good, so the aggregate good has completely lost that relational character: the goods are detached from the beings from whom they are good. This relational element of value, I believe, is better captured by the third theory I am about to describe.

#### Prefer additionally,

#### 1] An intrinsic feature to any action is the acceptance of the goodness of universal freedom, Gewirth 84 bracketed for grammar and gendered language

[Alan Gewirth, () "The Ontological Basis of Natural Law: A Critique and an Alternative" American Journal Of Jurisprudence: Vol. 29: Iss. 1 Article 5, 1984, https://scholarship.law.nd.edu/ajj/vol29/iss1/5/, DOA:9-10-2018 // WWBW Recut LHP AV]

Let me briefly sketch the main line of argument that leads to this conclusion. As I have said, the argument is based on the generic features of human action. To begin with, **every agent acts for purposes [t]he[y] regards as good.** Hence, **[t]he[y] must regard as necessary goods the freedom** and well being **that [is]** are the generic features and **necessary conditions of** his **action** and successful action in general. From this, it follows that **every agent logically must hold or accept** that he has **rights to these conditions**. For if he were **to deny** that he has **these rights**, then he **would** have to **admit that it is permissible** for other persons **to remove** from him the very **conditions** of freedom and well-being **that**, as **an agent**, he **must have**. But **it is contradictory** for him **to hold both that [t]he[y] must have these conditions and also that he may not have them.** Hence, on pain of self-contradiction, every agent must accept that he has rights to freedom and well-being. Moreover, **every agent must further admit that all other agents also have those rights, since all other actual or prospective agents have the same general characteristics of agency** on which he must ground his own right-claims. What I am saying, then, is that every agent, simply by virtue of being an agent, must regard his freedom and well being as necessary goods and must hold that he and all other actual or prospective agents have rights to these necessary goods. Hence, every agent, on pain of self-contradiction, must accept the following principle: Act in accord with the generic rights of your recipients as well as of yourself. The generic rights are rights to the generic features of action, freedom, and well-being. I call this the Principle of Generic Consistency (PGC), because it combines the formal consideration of consistency with the material consideration of the generic features and rights of action.

#### 2] Agency requires deliberation to choose what actions to take which creates a practical identity identical for every agent. It is the only form of ontology that can account for every individual, making it the only identity that can create obligations.

Christine M. Korsgaard, 1992

“The Sources of Normativity.” The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, Cambridge University.

The Solution: Those who think that the human mind is internally luminous and transparent to itself think that the term “self-consciousness” is appropriate because what we get in human consciousness is a direct encounter with the self. Those who think that the human mind has a reflective structure use the term too, but for a different reason. The reflective structure of the mind is a source of “self-consciousness” because it forces us to have a conception of ourselves. As Kant argues, this is a fact about what it is like to be reflectively conscious and it does not prove the existence of a metaphysical self. From a third person point of view, outside of the deliberative standpoint, it may look as if what happens when someone makes a choice is that the strongest of his conflicting desires wins. But that isn’t the way it is for you when you deliberate. When you deliberate, it is as if there were something over and above all of your desires, something that is you, and that chooses which desire to act on. This means that the principle or law by which you determine your actions is one that you regard as being expressive of yourself. To identify with such a principle or law is to be, in St. Paul’s famous phrase, a law to yourself.6 An agent might think of herself as a Citizen in the Kingdom of Ends. Or she might think of herself as a member of a family or an ethnic group or a nation. She might think of herself as the steward of her own interests, and then she will be an egoist. Or she might think of herself as the slave of her passions, and then she will be a wanton. And how she thinks of herself will determine whether it is the law of the Kingdom of Ends, or the law of some smaller group, or the law of the egoist, or the law of the wanton that is the law that she is to herself. The conception of one’s identity in question here is not a theoretical one, a view about what as a matter of inescapable scientific fact you are. It is better understood as a description under which you value yourself, a description under which you find your life to be worth living and your actions to be worth undertaking. So I will call this a conception of your practical identity. Practical identity is a complex matter and for the average person there will be a jumble of such conceptions. You are a human being, a woman or a man, an adherent of a certain religion, a member of an ethnic group, someone’s friend, and so on. And all of these identities give rise to reasons and obligations. Your reasons express your identity, your nature; your obligations spring from what that identity forbids.

#### Impacts: A] Since obligations arise from a universal identity, they must be the same for all, B] hijacks any role of the judge since judging is an identity contained within the practical one

#### 3] transcendental idealism – there’s a distinction between the noumenal world and the phenomenal world – freedom, as noumenal and undetermined by natural laws, is the supreme principle of ethics, Korsgaard 96:

Korsgaard, Christine. “Creating The Kingdom of Ends: Reciprocity and Responsibility in Personal Relations.” (p. 317-318). July 28, 1996 //Recut LHP AV

Kant's response to this problem is to maintain that the question should not be asked. **To ask how freedom and determinism are related is to inquire** **into** **the** **relation between the** **noumenal and phenomenal worlds**, a relation **about which it is** in principle **impossible to know** anything. But our understanding of what this response amounts to will depend on how we understand the distinction between the noumenal and phenomenal worlds, and the related distinction between the two standpoints from which Kant says we may view ourselves and our actions. This is a large issue which I cannot treat here in a satisfactory way, I shall simply declare my allegiance. On a familiar but as I think misguided interpretation, the distinction between the two worlds is an ontological one; as if behind the beings of this world were another set of beings, which have an active and controlling relation to the beings of this world, but which are inaccessible to us because of the limits of experience. According to this view, we occupy both worlds, and viewing ourselves from the two standpoints we discover two different sets of laws which describe and explain our conduct in the two different worlds. We act on the moral law in the noumenal world, the law of self-love in the phenomenal world. This view gives rise to familiar paradoxes about how evil actions are even possible, and how we could ever be held responsible for them if they were. On what I take to be the correct interpretation, **the distinction is not between two kinds of beings, but between the beings of this world insofar as they are authentically active and the same beings insofar as we are passively receptive to them**. **The "gap" in our knowledge exists not because of the limits of experience but because of its** **essential nature**: **to experience** something **is** (in part) **to be passively receptive** to it, **and therefore we cannot** have **experience**s of **activity** as such. **As thinkers and choosers we must regard ourselves as active** beings, **even though we cannot experience ourselves as active beings**, **and so we place ourselves among the noumena, necessarily, whenever we think and act.** According to this interpretation **laws of the phenomenal world** are laws that **describe and explain our behavior**. **But the laws of the noumenal world are laws which are addressed to us as active beings**; **their business is not to describe and explain** at all, **but to govern** what we do. **Reason has two employments, theoretical and practical.** We view ourselves as phenomena when we take on the theoretical task of describing and explaining our behavior; we view ourselves as noumena when our practical task is one of deciding what to do. **The two standpoints cannot be mixed because these two enterprises-explanation and decision- are mutually exclusive**. These two ways of understanding the noumenal/phenomenal distinction yield very different interpretations of Kant's strictures against trying to picture the relation between the noumenal and phenomenal worlds. On the ontological view, the question how the two worlds are related is one which, frustratingly, cannot be answered. On the active/passive view, it is one which cannot coherently be asked. **There is no question that is answered by my descriptions of how Marilyn's freedom interacts with the causal forces that determine her. For freedom is a concept with a practical employment, used in the choice and justification of action, not in explanation or prediction**; while causality is a concept of theory, used to explain and predict actions but not to justify them. There is no standpoint from which we are doing both of these things at once, and so there is no place from which to ask a question that includes both concepts in its answer. So, if I am myself Marilyn, and I am trying to decide whether to do something selfish, reflections on the disadvantages of my background are irrelevant. **I must act under the idea of freedom, and so I must act on what I regard as reasons.** Being underprivileged may sometimes be a cause of selfish behavior, but it is not a reason that can be offered in support of it by a person engaged in it. So although we do not necessarily say of Marilyn: "**her background gave her** some tough **incentives** to deal with, **but** still **it is up to her whether she treats them as reasons**," that is what she must say to herself. I say that we do not necessarily say this, because, as I am about to argue, whether we say it depends on whether we have decided to enter into reciprocal relations with her and so to hold her responsible. But in that case, it is better regarded as something we say not about but to her.

### Contention

#### Plan: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to eliminate patent protections for life-saving medicines. Rizvi 20:

Husna Rizvi, “WHAT IF…DRUG PATENTS WERE SCRAPPED?” 24 June 2020, <https://newint.org/features/2020/06/11/what-if-drug-patents-were-scrapped> //LHP AV DOA: 9/17/21

In 1955, virologist Jonas Salk was asked about the intellectual property rights of his polio vaccine. To which he responded: ‘**There is no patent**. Could you patent the sun?’ Salk’s choice to make the vaccine patent free ultimately beat back the US polio epidemic by 1962. The pharmaceuticals industry has ballooned in size since then, reaching an estimated value of $1.2 trillion in 2018, made possible by a patents system that grants firms at least 20 years’ exclusive rights to manufacture, sell and market new drugs. Although an estimated two-thirds of global research and development is paid out of the public purse, manufacturers can charge governments eyewatering sums for drugs. According to Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), it costs just $0.25 to $0.50 to make the daily dose of the tuberculosis drug bedaquiline. But manufacturer Johnson & Johnson charges over eight times that cost in developing countries. Patients require up to 14,600 pills over two years, pricing thousands out of treatment. The tension between public health and private profit has never been more visible, especially as the world searches for a vaccine against coronavirus. Advert Newint - ES FAM Sept 21 Some experts point to existing provisions to compel industry to release vital drugs during times of crisis. **World Trade Organization rules specify that governments can override patents** to allow other manufacturers **to produce generic versions of life-saving medicines** – **this is called compulsory licensing. But Big Pharma fights back with lawsuits.** Corporate Europe Observatory predicts a wave of ‘pandemic legal disputes’ if governments try using this provision to combat coronavirus. As during the AIDS crisis, when 39 transnational pharmaceutical companies sued Nelson Mandela for defying HIV drug licences, companies are unlikely to want to make an exception for Covid-19. **The pharmaceutical patents system is based on the belief that without patents, medical innovation will cease**. **But researchers have shown how firms stifle innovation, engaging in ‘killer acquisitions’ to buy up smaller innovative companies, solely to stop their drug development projects and remove future competition**. **It’s a broken system, not delivering the drugs** we need at prices we need. At the time of writing, the world death toll from Covid-19 is 350,000. Economist Joseph Stiglitz asks: what if a global network of laboratories, without Intellectual Property (IP) lawyers breathing down their necks, ‘monitored for emerging strains of a contagious virus, periodically updated an established formula for vaccinating against it, and then made that information available to companies and countries around the world?’ It’s not pie in the sky. **It’s how flu vaccine research already operates**. **The World Health Organization (WHO) convenes world experts twice a year to add emerging flu strains in order to update flu vaccines. Researchers from across 110 countries, funded largely by governments, are committed to this open-source science**. The infrastructure to gather, interpret and distribute actionable knowledge for the development of vaccines already exists. This system could be funded through prizes, Stiglitz suggests, rewarding companies that invent necessary new medicines. **Companies would need to agree to make products patent-free, be transparent over pricing and costs and share clinical trial data so that other countries can develop the same capacity**. Researchers at Global Justice Now also propose modelling democratically owned start-up firms with workers, clinicians and patients on their boards and on the Medicines Patent Pool (MPP), a UN body set up to increase access to drugs in the Global South. Governments would retain a controlling interest in these bodies. **Abolishing the IP burden would incentivize knowledge-sharing across borders, with open-source data that any WHO member could access.** With increasing vulnerability to pandemics what is needed is an ambitious strategy to compel industry to manufacture the drugs we need at scale. Transitional steps, proposed by Washington University professors Michele Boldrin and David Levine, include shortening patent terms to slowly but surely ‘decrease the strength of intellectual property interventions’. They hasten to add: ‘**the final goal cannot be anything short of abolition**.’

#### Life saving drugs are ones that reduce mortality chances – if you have a definition that a drug is life-saving, I won’t shift out of it, Mohamed 21:

Mohamed, Esraa & Habbani, Khalid & Awad, Mousnad. (2021). Life-saving Drugs in Sudan: A Matter of Definitions and Concepts. American Journal of Epidemiology. 4. 1-9. 10.37871/ajeph. //LHP AV

**Life-Saving Drugs** (LSDs) **are the drugs that save someone’s life, require immediate administration** in most of the cases, as they sustain life, **and prevent complications**.

#### Vote aff –

#### 1] IP rights violate an individual’s actual right to property and the grounds on which they are justified,

Cernea and Uszkai 12 Cernea, Mihail-Valentin, and Radu Uszkai. *The Clash between Global Justice and Pharmaceutical Patents: A Critical Analysis*. 2012, the-clash-between-global-justice-and-drug-patents-a-critical-analysis.pdf. SJEP

To make this point clearer, we regard property as an ethical institution which emerged in the context of reiterated conflict between agents for tangible goods. A useful analogy would be, for example, the particular way in which David Hume discusses the emergence of justice in the context of scarcity in which agents pursue their own interests4 . As a result, the purpose of property rights would be that of avoiding or minimizing the possibility of conflict and that of increasing the costs of free-riding or trespassing. Let’s take the following example which will illustrate better our point. Assume that X is a philosophy student and has a copy of Immanuel Kant’s Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Y is a college of him but he does not have the book. They both have to write an essay on Kant’s categorical imperative. Because Y does not have the book, let’s assume that he decides, whether by the use of coercion or fraud to take his book. As a result, the theft leaves X without his property because tangible goods are rivalrous in consumption. Both student can’t, at the same time but in a different place read about Kant’s categorical imperative from the same copy. Now a different example: suppose X invents a new way of harvesting corn and Y harvests his corn accordingly. This situation is quite different in comparison to the case we presented earlier, because Y does not leaves X without either his new harvesting mechanisms which he created but neither without the idea behind the mechanism. It would be hard to say that Y stole something from X because the consumption of intangible goods such as ideas does not have the same rivalrous property as a copy of a book written by Kant. Actually, the existence of the patent system fosters the scarcity of ideas. In this context patents represent unjustified state-granted monopolies. Moreover, intellectual property rights have another profound immoral consequence: it limits the use of tangible objects which we acquired fully in line with market rules.

#### 2] Right of necessity – nations can legitimately break patents in order to produce life-saving medicines, Bierson 21:

Marshall Bierson, [Marshall is currently completing his PhD in Philosophy at Florida State University. His primarily studies the intersection of ethics and the nature of persons. Outside of Academia, Marshall also directs curricular design for high school debate camps with the Victory Briefs Institute.] “Intellectual Property and the Right of Necessity” August 18, 2021, <https://www.prindlepost.org/2021/08/intellectual-property-and-the-right-of-necessity/> //LHP AV DOA:9/14/21

The Right of Necessity and Intellectual Property **If there is a right of necessity, what implication would that have for i**ntellectual **p**roperty rights **over life-saving medication?** **Life-saving medication**, almost by definition, **is often necessary for survival**. Thus, if **the right to necessity justifies** stealing bread from those who have extra, so too it would seem to justify **stealing a vial of unaffordable medication**. Similarly, if I can steal an unaffordable vial of life-saving medication to save a life, **then it would be strange to think I cannot violate an international patent to create that life-saving vial**. It seems, then, that if we accept the old doctrine that there exists a right of necessity, it **would have profound implications for the justice of intellectual property law. Nations, according to such reasoning, possess a natural right to break patents if it is necessary to produce life-saving medication for those who could otherwise not afford them**. (The affordability qualification is an important one. Just as it would be theft for me, who can afford to buy food, to steal a loaf of bread. So too it would be unjust to violate international patents for patients who can otherwise afford to buy the medication.) But even with the affordability qualification in place, **there is currently a huge problem of access to life-saving medications by the global poor. As such, the right of necessity suggests a standing right to break many international medical patents.**

#### The right of necessity is a logical constraint on the coercive powers of the state – even if not ethical, reducing IP for life saving medicines is not in the jurisdiction of legal punishment – that would undermine the very foundation of the omnilateral will, Koch 92:

Koch, Andrew M. "Immanuel Kant, The Right of Necessity, and the Liberal Foundation of Social Welfare" Southeastern Political Review, 20: 2 (Fall 1992) 295-314. <https://libres.uncg.edu/ir/asu/f/koch_andrew_1992_Immanuel_Kant.pdf> //LHP AV DOA: 9/14/21

**Kant** did not leave the discussion on the functions of law here. In the appendix to Metaphysical Elements of Justice he **suggested two caveats to the ability of the state to compel human action**. There are two areas of human interaction where justice, as the state's use of legitimate coercive force, does not serve its intended purpose. In these two areas **the coercive power of the state cannot, logically, be effective in regulating human behavior** or protecting human freedom. The first of these exceptions to the role played by the law in regulating human interaction is what Kant called the "right of equity." The second he called the "right of necessity." In discussing the right of equity, Kant asserted that the law is not applicable to issues involving the subjective moral conscience of a person. For example, in establishing a private contract between two individuals all the possible contingencies may not be foreseen. In such a case one of the contracting partners may have to appeal to the fairness or sense of "equity" in the other. Kant defined this appeal to personal conscience as "right without coercion." (Kant 1965, 39) The judicial system cannot oversee all the possible facets of interaction, therefore appeals to "fairness" will be part of the interaction of individuals. As part of the general discussion of morality, Kant believed that a general "moral sentiment" can be engendered in individuals through education and moral training. The process of moral training will serve to regulate what is "fair," even when the law cannot be directly engaged. Kant's second caveat to his theory of justice, however, is far more important for the consideration of the state's responsibilities with regard to its citizenry. **Kant defined the right of necessity as essentially "coercion without right."** (Kant 1965, 39) Stated directly**, "necessity" is the right to take any action necessary in order to preserve one's own life.** By "necessity" Kant meant considerably more than a notion of self defense. The right of self defense implies a right to preserve one's life if that life is threatened by another. **The right of necessity, on the other hand, is the right to take action that causes harm or death to another, even to a person who is not a direct threat to one's own life and safety.** This imagined right is supposed to give me permission to take the life of another person when my own life is in danger, even if he has done me no harm. (Kant 1965, 41) **Necessity involves the interaction of two or more people. According to Kant's discussion of civil society, the law is essential for the regulation of that interaction**. Kant asserted, however, that **when necessity is the issue, the law is ineffective as a restraint on human behavior.** It is quite obvious that **this** conception implies a self-contradiction within jurisprudence,...[and] ... **belongs only to ethics**. (Kant 1965, 41) The right of necessity is an issue that can only be addressed in an ethical context. But **Kant did not suggest that acts done out of necessity are ethical or enjoy insulation from moral condemnation**. The contrary is actually the case. **An action done out of necessity may be immoral and still not be appropriately subject to punitive legal action.** This is the case because **law cannot logically deter actions that are generated out of fear for one's survival.** **Necessity is invoked in a context in which the deterrent function of the law is ineffective**. Kant suggested that **when faced with the imminent threat of losing one's life there is nothing that the coercive apparatus of the state can do to compel a particular type of behavior.** **The law, and the force of punishment, can have no effect on an individual's behavior where necessity is at issue. The law cannot serve as a check on moral or social injustices**. The threat of punishment has no meaning if there is no penalty which can be worse than certain death. **The pursuit of selfpreservation**, while it may violate the legal statutes of written law, **cannot logically be punished**. Kant was very clear on this issue. A penal law applying to such a situation could never have the effect intended, for the threat of an evil that is still uncertain cannot outweigh the fear of an evil that is certain. **Hence, we must judge that, although an act of self-presentation through violence is not inculpable, it still is unpunishable**...(Kant 1965, 41) The law cannot apply to an action done out of necessity because it contains no effective threat of coercion behind it. Necessity is described as an important exception to the role positive law plays in maintaining and protecting a common quantity of freedom within the state and society. **The state and its laws are designed to protect the freedom of each of society's members. The state cannot function effectively in circumstances where the adherence to its laws cannot be guaranteed through the use of sanctions**. **"Necessity" is, logically, a constraint on the effectiveness of the law**. In raising the issue of the conditions required for the "effective" law, Kant has provided a context for questioning the state's responsibilities on issues of social policy. What conditions must be present in order for the law to function effectively? Under what conditions can the law fulfill its purpose of protecting the freedom of the citizenry? Kant realized that not all individuals can be expected to be "good." Kant asserted, however, that through a system of laws individuals can be compelled to respect the rights of others. But the conditions for that compliance must first exist. The legal system's intended purpose of protecting the freedom of the citizens cannot be fulfilled under conditions in which necessity is legitimately involved**. The state cannot fulfill its function of compelling individuals to respect the freedom of others unless the state's system of laws are sufficient to deter individual egoism at the expense of other's freedom**. Laws have no power to compel when "necessity" is at issue. **The problem necessity generates for the functioning of the law raises questions about the role of the state in a very broad social context**. If necessity inhibits the effective performance of the law, and effective laws are necessary in order to protect the citizens, then the function of the state must go beyond acting simply as the repository for collective force. The state must act to create the conditions in which the citizens are secure from violence. In order to do this the state must assure that it has created the conditions in which the law is an effective mechanism for deterring violence. **The state must seek to minimize necessity as a motivation for behavior because action generated out of necessity takes place outside of the arena in which the law is effective.** Social welfare is the state's mechanism for removing economic necessity as a motivation for action. Welfare assists in creating the conditions in which the "rule of law" is meaningful and effective. Therefore, the state's legal and coercive functions are inseparable from its welfare functions.

### Underview

#### 1] 1ar theory –

#### A] the aff gets it – otherwise the neg can engage in infinite abuse, making debate impossible

#### B] drop the debater because the 1ar is too short to win theory and substance

#### C] no RVIs – the 2nr has enough time and the 2ar needs strategic flexibility

#### D] Fairness is a voter – debate’s a game that requires objective evaluation – judges have obligations to vote for the better debater which fairness controls. It also controls truth value – absent fairness, args were not subject to contestation, so they only won their arg because they were unfair.

#### 2] 1ar theory first –

#### A] Strat skew – short 2AR means I need to collapse to one layer to counter the long 2N collapse

#### B] Epistemic Indict – if the 1N was abusive then my ability to respond was skewed so you can’t truly evaluate the 1nc

#### C] Investment – it’s a much larger strategic loss because 1min is ¼ of the 1AR vs 1/7 of the 1NC which means there’s more abuse if I’m devoting a larger fraction of time

#### 3] Presumption and permissibility affirm –

#### A] we presume statements true – if I said my name was Arjun, you would believe me absent evidence to the contrary

#### B] affirming is harder – the 1ar has to answer 7 minutes of offense and hedge against a 6 minute 2nr collapse and empirics – presumption is this card’s only implication, Shah 1-29,

[Sachin Shah “A Statistical Analysis of the Impact of the Transition to Online Tournaments in Lincoln-Douglas Debate by Sachin Shah.” January 29, 2021, http://nsdupdate.com/2021/a-statistical-analysis-of-the-impact-of-the-transition-to-online-tournaments-in-lincoln-douglas-debate-by-sachin-shah/]

It is also interesting to look at the trend **over** multiple topics. Of the **238 bid** distributing **tournaments from** August **2015** to present[7], **the negative won 52.32% of rounds** (p-value < 10^-30, 99% confidence interval [51.84%, 52.81%]). Of elimination rounds, the negative won 55.79% of rounds (p-value < 10^-15, 99% confidence interval [54.08%, 57.50%]). This continues to suggest **the bias might be structural and not topic specific as this analysis now includes 18 topics.**

### ROB

#### The role of the ballot is to evaluate the truth or falsity of the resolution through a normatively justified framework via fair, safe, and educational arguments. No skep, no tricks, yes phil and yes theory. Prefer it –

#### 1] Reciprocity – normative frameworks provide a reciprocal burden of justifying an obligation with the ability to turn them – other frameworks are arbitrarily impact exclusive and don’t articulate a 1-1 burden

#### 2] Philosophy – only our role of the ballot incentivizes nuanced discussions over the interactions of different ethical theories. That comes first –

#### A] constitutivism – LD debate is a values debate which means the intrinsic purpose of the activity is philosophical discussion

#### B] hijacks any voter – the question of why those are good relies on philosophical justification, ie constitutivism or something.

#### 3] Collapses – A] any framing presupposes a motivation to vote one way or another which means all framings concede the validity of normativity B] Ethics comes prior to logical truth, Peirce 02:

CS Peirce, “CP 2.198” 1902, <https://colorysemiotica.files.wordpress.com/2014/08/peirce-collectedpapers.pdf> //LHP AV

Peirce: CP 2.198 Cross-Ref:†† 198. **Ethics** †3: is another subject which for many years seemed to me to be completely foreign to logic. Indeed I doubted very much whether it was anything more than a practical science, or Art; although I had always been interested in ethical systems. About twenty years ago, I began to be impressed with the importance of the theory; but it has only been within five or six years that all the **intimacy of its relation to logic has been revealed to me**. It may very easily happen that the over-development of a man's moral conception should interfere with his progress in philosophy. The protoplasm of philosophy has to be in a liquid state in order that the operations of metabolism may go on. Now morality is a hardening agent. It is astonishing how many abominable scoundrels there are among sincerely moral people. The difficulty is that morality chokes its own stream. Like any other field, more than any other, it needs improvement, advance. Moral ideas must be a rising tide, or with the ebb foulness will be cast up. But morality, doctrinaire conservatist that it is, destroys its own vitality by resisting change, and positively insisting, This is eternally right: That is eternally wrong. The tendency of philosophers has always been to make their assertions too absolute. Nothing stands more in the way of a comprehension of the universe and of the mind. But in morals this tendency acquires triple strength. The practical side of ethics is its most obviously important side; and in practical matters, the first maxim is that everything may be exaggerated. That is the substance of Aristotle's Ethics. The moral spirit may very easily be carried to excess: all the more so, that the essence of that spirit is to insist upon its own absolute autocracy. All that is one side of the shield; but the other side is quite equally important. We are too apt to define ethics to ourselves as the science of right and wrong. That cannot be correct, for the reason that right and wrong are ethical conceptions which it is the business of that science to develope and to justify. A science cannot have for its fundamental problem to distribute objects among categories of its own creation; for underlying that problem must be the task of establishing those categories. **The fundamental problem of ethics is** not, therefore, What is right, but, **What am I prepared deliberately to accept as the statement of what I want to do, what am I to aim at, what am I after? To what is the force of my will to be directed**? **Now logic is a study of the means of attaining the end of thought**. **It cannot solve that problem until it clearly knows what that end is**. **Life can have but one end. It is Ethics which defines that end. It is, therefore, impossible to be thoroughly and rationally logical except upon an ethical basis**. Had I fully comprehended this great principle early in life, I should undoubtedly have been over-influenced by the moral spirit, and my present understanding of logic which, although it is far in advance of anybody else's, is, as compared with what it ought to be, as the scrawl on an infant's slate to a cartoon of Raphael, would have been even narrower and poorer than it now is--probably almost worthless. Before my logic was brought under the guidance of ethics, it was already a window through which much important truth could be seen, but dim with dust, distorting details by striæ. Under the guidance of ethics I took it and melted it down, reduced it to a fluid condition. I filtered it till it was clear. I cast it in the true mould; and when it had become solid, I spared no elbow-grease in polishing it. It is now a comparatively brilliant lens, showing much that was not discernible before. I believe that it will only remain to those who come after me to perfect the processes. I am as confident as I am of death that Logic will hereafter be infinitely superior to what it is as I leave it; but my labors will have done good work toward its improvement.