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## 1AC

### 1AC – Framework

#### The meta ethic is practical reason-

#### [1] Ethics must be derived a priori – moral truths exist independently of that in the empirical world. Prefer –

#### A] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents which makes it action guiding

#### B] Naturalistic fallacy – experience only tells us what is since we can only perceive what is, not what ought to be, this means experience may be generally useful but should not be the basis for ethical action.

#### [2] Practical Reason is that procedure. To ask for why we should be reasoners concedes its authority since it uses reason – anything else is escapable and non-actionguiding which is the problem of regress. Aggregation is nonsensical since a] it impedes on one persons ends for another and b] assumes everyone values the same thing.

#### [3] Morality means we must treat others as ends in themselves.

Korsgaard ’83 (Christine M., “Two Distinctions in Goodness,” The Philosophical Review Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 169-195, JSTOR) // LEX JB [brackets for gendered language]

The argument shows how Kant's idea of justification works. It can be read as a kind of regress upon the conditions, starting from an important assumption. The assumption is that **when a rational being makes a choice or undertakes an action, [they] supposes the object to be good, and its pursuit to be justified**. At least, if there is a categorical imperative there must be objectively good ends, for then there are necessary actions and so necessary ends (G 45-46/427-428 and Doctrine of Virtue 43-44/384-385). **In order for there to be any objectively good ends, however, there must be something that is unconditionally good and so can serve as a sufficient condition of their goodness**. Kant considers what this might be**: it cannot be an object of inclination**, for those have only a conditional worth, "**for if the inclinations and the needs founded on them did not exist, their object would be without worth**" (G 46/428). It cannot be the inclinations themselves because a rational being would rather be free from them. Nor can it be external things, which serve only as means. So, Kant asserts, **the unconditionally valuable thing must be "humanity"** or "rational nature," which he defines as "the power set to an end" (G 56/437 and DV 51/392). Kant explains that **regarding your existence as a rational being as an end in itself is a "subjective principle of human action."** By this I understand him to mean that **we must regard ourselves as capable of** conferring **value upon the objects of our choice, the ends that we set, because we must regard our ends as good**. But since "every other rational being thinks of his existence by the same rational ground which holds also for myself' (G 47/429), **we must regard others as capable of conferring value by reason of their rational choices and so also as ends in themselves**. Treating another as an end in itself thus involves making that person's ends as far as possible your own (G 49/430). The ends that are chosen by any rational being, possessed of the humanity or rational nature that is fully realized in a good will, take on the status of objective goods. They are not intrinsically valuable, but they are objectively valuable in the sense that every rational being has a reason to promote or realize t hem. For this reason it is our duty to promote the happiness of others-the ends that they choose-and, in general, to make the highest good our end.

#### [4] Practical reason means we must be able to universalize our maxims—our judgements are authoritative and can’t only apply to ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me

Siyar 99 (Jamsheed Aiam Siyar: Kant’s Conception of Practical Reason. Tufts University, 1999: JWC)

Now, **when I represent my end as to be done, I represent it as binding me to certain courses of action**, precluding other actions, etc. Thus, **my ends function as constraints for me** in that they determine what I can or must do (at least if I am to be consistent). I may of course give up an end such as that of eating ice cream at a future point; yet while I have the end, **I must see myself as bound to do what is necessary to realize it.**35 Thus, **I must represent my ends as constraints that I have adopted**, constraints that structure the possible space of choice and action for me. Further, given that my end is rationally determined, I take it to be generally recognizable that my end functions as a rationally determined constraint. That is**, I take it that other subjects can also recognize my end as an objective constraint**, for I take it that they as well as myself can cognize its determining grounds—the source of its objective worth—through the exercise of reason. Indeed, in representing an end, I in effect demand recognition for it from other subjects: since the end functions as an objective though self-imposed constraint for me, I must demand that this constraint be recognized as such. The thought here is simply that if I am committed to some end, e.g. my ice cream eating policy, I must act in certain ways to realize it. In this context, I cannot be indifferent to the attitudes and actions of others, for these may either help or hinder my pursuit of my end. **Hence, if I am in fact committed to realizing my end, i.e. if I represent an end at all, I must demand that the worth of my end, its status as to be done, be recognized by other.**

#### Thus the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative. To clarify, consequences don’t link to the framework.

#### Prefer additionally –

#### [1] Kantian theory has the best tools for fighting oppression through combatting ethical egoism and abstraction

Farr 02 [Arnold (prof of phil @ UKentucky, focusing on German idealism, philosophy of race, postmodernism, psychoanalysis, and liberation philosophy). “Can a Philosophy of Race Afford to Abandon the Kantian Categorical Imperative?” JOURNAL of SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, Vol. 33 No. 1, Spring 2002, 17–32 // LEX JB]

**One of the most popular criticisms of Kant’s** moral philosophy is that it is too formalistic.13 That is, the universal nature of the categorical imperative leaves it devoid of content. Such a principle is useless since moral decisions are made by concrete individuals in a concrete, historical, and social situation. This type of criticism lies behind Lewis Gordon’s rejection of any attempt to ground an antiracist position on Kantian principles. The rejection of universal principles for the sake of emphasizing the historical embeddedness of the human agent is widespread in recent philosophy and social theory. I will argue here on Kantian grounds that although a distinction between the **universal and the concrete is a valid distinction, the unity of the two is required** for an understanding of human agency. The attack on Kantian formalism began with Hegel’s criticism of the Kantian philosophy.14 The list of contemporary theorists who follow Hegel’s line of criticism is far too long to deal with in the scope of this paper. Although these theorists may approach the problem of Kantian formalism from a variety of angles, the spirit of their criticism is basically the same: The universality of the categorical imperative is an abstraction from one’s empirical conditions. Kant is often accused of making the moral agent an abstract, empty, noumenal subject. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Kantian subject is an embodied, empirical, concrete subject. However, this concrete subject has a dual nature. Kant claims in the Critique of Pure Reason as well as in the Grounding that human beings have an intelligible and empirical character.15 It is impossible to understand and do justice to Kant’s moral theory without taking seriously the relation between these two characters. The very concept of morality is impossible without the tension between the two. By “empirical character” Kant simply means that we have a sensual nature. We are physical creatures with physical drives or desires. The very fact that **I cannot simply satisfy my desires without considering the rightness or wrongness of my actions suggests that my empirical character must be held in check** by something, or else I behave like a Freudian id. My empiri- cal character must be held in check by my intelligible character, which is the legislative activity of practical reason. **It is through our intelligible character that we formulate principles that keep our empirical impulses in check. The categorical imperative is the supreme principle of morality that is constructed by the moral agent in his/her moment of self-transcendence.** What I have called self-transcendence may be best explained in the following passage by Onora O’Neill: In restricting our maxims to those that meet the test of the categorical imperative we refuse to base our lives on maxims that necessarily make our own case an exception. The reason why a universilizability criterion is morally signiﬁcant is that it makes our own case no special exception (G, IV, 404). In accepting the Categorical Imperative we accept the moral reality of other selves, and hence the possibility (not, note, the reality) of a moral community. **The Formula of Universal Law enjoins no more than that we act only on maxims that are open to others also**.16 O’Neill’s description of the universalizability criterion includes the notion of self-transcendence that I am working to explicate here to the extent that like self-transcendence, universalizable moral principles require that the individ- ual think beyond his or her own particular desires. **The individual is not allowed to exclude others as rational moral agents who have the right to act as he acts in a given situation.** For example, if I decide to use another person merely as a means for my own end I must recognize the other person’s right to do the same to me. I cannot consistently will that I use another as a means only and will that I not be used in the same manner by another. Hence, the universalizability criterion is a principle of consistency and a principle of inclusion. That is, in choosing my maxims I attempt to include the perspective of other moral agents. … Whereas most criticisms are aimed at the formulation of universal law and the formula of autonomy, our analysis here will focus on the formula of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends, since we have already addressed the problem of universality. The latter will be discussed ﬁrst. At issue here is what Kant means by “kingdom of ends.” Kant writes: “By ‘kingdom’ I understand a systematic union of different rational beings through common laws.”32 The above passage indicates that Kant recognizes different, perhaps different kinds, of rational beings; however, the problem for most critics of Kant lies in the assumption that Kant suggests that the “kingdom of ends” requires that we abstract from personal differences and content of private ends. The Kantian conception of rational beings requires such an abstraction. Some feminists and philosophers of race have found this abstract notion of rational beings problematic because they take it to mean that rationality is necessarily white, male, and European.33 Hence, the systematic union of rational beings can mean only the systematic union of white, European males. I ﬁnd this interpretation of Kant’s moral theory quite puzzling. Surely another interpretation is available. That is, the implication that in Kant’s philosophy, rationality can only apply to white, European males does not seem to be the only alternative. The problem seems to lie in the requirement of abstraction. There are two ways of looking at the abstraction requirement that I think are faithful to Kant’s text and that overcome the criticisms of this requirement. **First, the abstraction requirement may be best understood as a demand for intersubjectivity or recognition. Second, it may be understood as an attempt to avoid ethical egoism in determining maxims for our actions.** It is unfortunate that Kant never worked out a theory of intersubjectivity, as did his successors Fichte and Hegel. However, this is not to say that there is not in Kant’s philosophy a tacit theory of intersubjectivity or recognition. The abstraction requirement simply demands that in the midst of our concrete differences we recognize ourselves in the other and the other in ourselves. That is, we recognize in others the humanity that we have in common. Recognition of our common humanity is at the same time recognition of rationality in the other. We recognize in the other the capacity for selfdetermination and the capacity to legislate for a kingdom of ends. This brings us to the second interpretation of the abstraction requirement. **To avoid ethical egoism one must abstract from (think beyond) one’s own personal interest and subjective maxims. That is, the categorical imperative requires that I recognize that I am a member of the realm of rational beings.** Hence, I organize my maxims in consideration of other rational beings. Under such a principle other people cannot be treated merely as a means for my end but must be treated as ends in themselves. **The merit of the categorical imperative for a philosophy of race is that it contravenes racist ideology to the extent that racist ideology is based on the use of persons of a different race as a means to an end rather than as ends in themselves.** Embedded in the formulation of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends is the recognition of the common hope for humanity. That is, maxims ought to be chosen on the basis of an ideal, a hope for the amelioration of humanity. This ideal or ethical commonwealth (as Kant calls it in the Religion) is the kingdom of ends.34 Although the merits of Kant’s moral theory may be recognizable at this point, we are still in a bit of a bind. It still seems problematic that the moral theory of a racist is essentially an antiracist theory. Further, what shall we do with Henry Louis Gates’s suggestion that we use the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime to deconstruct the Grounding? What I have tried to suggest is that instead of abandoning the categorical imperative we should attempt to deepen our understanding of it and its place in Kant’s critical philosophy. A deeper reading of the Grounding and Kant’s philosophy in general may produce the deconstruction35 suggested by Gates. However, a text is not necessarily deconstructed by reading it against another. Texts often deconstruct themselves if read properly. To be sure, the best way to understand a text is to read it in context. Hence, if the Grounding is read within the context of the critical philosophy, the tools for a deconstruction of the text are provided by its context and the tensions within the text. Gates is right to suggest that the Grounding must be deconstructed. However, this deconstruction requires much more than reading the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime against the Grounding. It requires a complete engagement with the critical philosophy. Such an engagement discloses some of Kant’s very signiﬁcant claims about humanity and the practical role of reason. With this disclosure, deconstruction of the Grounding can begin. **What deconstruction will reveal is not necessarily the inconsistency of Kant’s moral philosophy or the racist or sexist nature of the categorical imperative, but rather, it will disclose the disunity between Kant’s theory and his own feelings about blacks and women. Although the theory is consistent and emancipatory and should apply to all persons, Kant the man has his own personal and moral problems. Although Kant’s attitude toward people of African descent was deplorable, it would be equally deplorable to reject the categorical imperative without ﬁrst exploring its emancipatory potential.**

#### [2] An understanding of Kantianism is key to understanding the law in the real world because states abide by inviolable side-constraints in their constitutions – outweighs on topicality because all states abide by side constraints

Otteson 09 [(James R., professor of philosophy and economics at Yeshiva University) “Kantian Individualism and Political Libertarianism,” The Independent Review, v. 13, n. 3, Winter, [2009](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10790-015-9506-9)] TDI Recut Lex VM

It is difficult to imagine a stronger defense of the “sacred” dignity of individual agency. Kantian individuality is premised on its rational nature and its entailed inherent dignity, and the rest of his moral philosophy arguably is built on this vision.1 Kant relies on a similarly robust conception of individuality in work other than his explicitly moral philosophy. The 1784 essay “An Answer to the Question: ‘What Is Enlightenment?’” (Kant 1991), for example, emphasizes in strong terms the threat that paternalism poses to one’s will. Kant argues that “enlightenment” (Aufklärung) involves a transition from moral and intellectual immaturity, wherein one depends on others to make one’s moral and intellectual decisions, to maturity, wherein one makes such decisions for oneself. One cannot effect this transition if one remains under another’s tutelage, and, as a corollary, one compromises another’s enlightenment if one undertakes to make such decisions for the other person—which, as Kant argues, is the case under a paternalistic government. Kant also writes in his 1786 essay “What Is Orientation in Thinking?” that “To think for oneself means to look within oneself (i.e. in one’s own reason) for the supreme touchstone of truth; and the maxim of thinking for oneself at all times is enlightenment” (1991, 249, italics and bold in the original). These passages are consistent with the position he takes in Grounding that a person who depends on others is acting heteronomously, not autonomously, and is to that extent not exercising a free moral will. These passages also help to clarify Kant’s notion of personhood and rational agency by indicating some of their practical implications. For example, on the basis of his argument, one would expect him to argue for setting severe limits on the authority that any group of people, including the state, may exercise over others: because individual freedom is necessary both to achieve enlightenment and to exercise one’s moral agency, Kant should argue that no group may impinge on that freedom without thereby acting immorally. Kant expressly draws this conclusion in his 1793 essay “On the Common Saying: ‘This May Be True in Theory, but It Does Not Apply in Practice’”: Right is the restriction of each individual’s freedom so that it harmonises with the freedom of everyone else (in so far as this is possible within the terms of a general law). And public right is the distinctive quality of the external laws which make this constant harmony possible. Since every restriction of freedom through the arbitrary will of another party is termed coercion, it follows that a civil constitution is a relationship among free men who are subject to coercive laws, while they retain their freedom within the general union with their fellows. (1991, 73, emphasis in original) Kant insists on the protection of a sphere of liberty for each individual to self-legislate under universalizable laws of rationality, consistent with the formulation of the categorical imperative requiring the treatment of others “always at the same time as an end and never simply as a means” (1981, 36). This formulation of the categorical imperative might even logically entail the position Kant articulates about “right,” “public right,” and “freedom.” Persons do not lose their personhood when they join a civil community, so they cannot rationally endorse a state that will be destructive of that personhood; on the contrary, according to Kant, a person enters civil society rationally willing that the society will protect both his own agency and that of others. Robert B. Pippen rightly says that for Kant “political duties are a subset of moral duties” (1985, 107–42), but the argument here puts it slightly differently: political rights, or “dignities,” derive from moral rights, which for Kant are determined by one’s moral agency. Thus, the only “coercive laws” to which individuals may rationally allow themselves to be subject in civil society are those that require respect for each others’ moral agency (and provide for the punishment of infractions thereof) (see Pippen 1985, 121). When Kant comes to state his own moral justification for the state in the 1797 Metaphysics of Morals, this claim is exactly the one he makes: the state is necessary for securing the conditions of “Right”—in other words, the conditions under which persons can exercise their autonomous agency (see 1991, 132–35). Consistent with this interpretation, Kant elsewhere endorses free trade and open markets on grounds that make his concern for “harmony” in the preceding passage reminiscent of Adam Smithian invisible-hand arguments. In his 1784 essay “Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose,” Kant writes: “Individual men and even entire nations little imagine that, while they are pursuing their own ends, each in his own way and often in opposition to others, they are unwittingly guided in their advance along a course intended by nature. They are unconsciously promoting an end which, even if they knew what it was, would scarcely arouse their interest” (1991, 41). This statement is similar to Smith’s statement of the invisible-hand argument.2 Kant proceeds to endorse some of the same laissez-faire economic policies that Smith advocated—for example, in his discussion in his 1786 work “Conjectures on the Beginning of Human History” of the benefits of “mutual exchange” and in his claim that “there can be no wealth-producing activity without freedom” (1991, 230–31, emphasis in original), as well as in his claim in the 1795 Perpetual Peace that “the spirit of commerce” is motivated by people’s “mutual self-interest” and thus “cannot exist side by side with war” (1991, 114, emphasis in original).3 Finally, although Kant argues that we cannot know exactly what direction human progress will take, he believes we can nevertheless be confident that mankind is progressing.4 Thus, in “Universal History” he writes: The highest purpose of nature—i.e. the development of all natural capacities—can be fulfilled for mankind only in society, and nature intends that man should accomplish this, and indeed all his appointed ends, by his own efforts. This purpose can be fulfilled only in a society which has not only the greatest freedom, and therefore a continual antagonism among its members, but also the most precise specification and preservation of the limits of this freedom in order that it can co-exist with the freedom of others. The highest task which nature has set for mankind must therefore be that of establishing a society in which freedom under external laws would be combined to the greatest possible extent with irresistible force, in other words of establishing a perfectly just civil constitution. (1991, 45–46, emphasis in original) Kant’s argument in this essay runs as follows: human progress is possible, but only in conditions of a civil society whose design allows this progress; because the progress is possible only as individuals become enlightened, and individual enlightenment is in turn possible only when individuals are free from improper coercion and paternalism, human progress is therefore possible only under a state that defends individual freedom. Kant believes that individuals have the best chance to be happy under a limited civil government, and he therefore argues that even such a laudable goal as increasing human happiness is not a justifiable role of the state: “But the whole concept of an external right is derived entirely from the concept of freedom in the mutual external relationships of human beings, and has nothing to do with the end which all men have by nature (i.e. the aim of achieving happiness) or with the recognized means of attaining this end. And thus the latter end must on no account interfere as a determinant with the laws governing external right” (“Theory and Practice,” 1991, 73, emphasis in original). The Kantian state is hence limited on the principled grounds of respecting agency; the fact that this limitation in his view provides the conditions enabling enlightenment, progress, and ultimately happiness is a great but ancillary benefit. Thus, the positions Kant takes on nonpolitical issues would seem to suggest a libertarian political position. And Kant explicitly avows such a state. In “Universal History,” he writes: Furthermore, civil freedom can no longer be so easily infringed without disadvantage to all trades and industries, and especially to commerce, in the event of which the state’s power in its external relations will also decline. . . . If the citizen is deterred from seeking his personal welfare in any way he chooses which is consistent with the freedom of others, the vitality of business in general and hence also the strength of the whole are held in check. For this reason, restrictions placed upon personal activities are increasingly relaxed, and general freedom of religion is granted. And thus, although folly and caprice creep in at times, enlightenment gradually arises. (1991, 50–51, emphasis in original) In “Theory and Practice,” Kant writes that “the public welfare which demands first consideration lies precisely in that legal constitution which guarantees everyone his freedom within the law, so that each remains free to seek his happiness in whatever way he thinks best, so long as he does not violate the lawful freedom and rights of his fellow subjects at large” and that “[n]o-one can compel me to be happy in accordance with his conception of the welfare of others, for each may seek his happiness in whatever way he sees fit, so long as he does not infringe upon the freedom of others to pursue a similar end which can be reconciled with the freedom of everyone else within a workable general law” (1991, 80, emphasis in original, and 74). In a crucial passage in Metaphysics of Morals, Kant writes that the “Universal Principle of Right” is “‘[e]very action which by itself or by its maxim enables the freedom of each individual’s will to co-exist with the freedom of everyone else in accordance with a universal law is right.’” He concludes, “Thus the universal law of right is as follows: let your external actions be such that the free application of your will can co-exist with the freedom of everyone in accordance with a universal law” (1991, 133, emphasis in original).5 This stipulation becomes for Kant the grounding justification for the existence of a state, its raison d’être, and the reason we leave the state of nature is to secure this sphere of maximum freedom compatible with the same freedom of all others. Because this freedom must be complete, in the sense of being as full as possible given the existence of other persons who demand similar freedom, it entails that the state may—indeed, must—secure this condition of freedom, but undertake to do nothing else because any other state activities would compromise the very autonomy the state seeks to defend. Kant’s position thus outlines and implies a political philosophy that is broadly libertarian; that is, it endorses a state constructed with the sole aim of protecting its citizens against invasions of their liberty. For Kant, individuals create a state to protect their moral agency, and in doing so they consent to coercion only insofar as it is required to prevent themselves or others from impinging on their own or others’ agency. In his argument, individuals cannot rationally consent to a state that instructs them in morals, coerces virtuous behavior, commands them to trade or not, directs their pursuit of happiness, or forcibly requires them to provide for their own or others’ pursuits of happiness. And except in cases of punishment for wrongdoing,6 this severe limitation on the scope of the state’s authority must always be respected: “The rights of man must be held sacred, however great a sacrifice the ruling power may have to make. There can be no half measures here; it is no use devising hybrid solutions such as a pragmatically conditioned right halfway between right and utility. For all politics must bend the knee before right, although politics may hope in return to arrive, however slowly, at a stage of lasting brilliance” (Perpetual Peace, 1991, 125). The implication is that a Kantian state protects against invasions of freedom and does nothing else; in the absence of invasions or threats of invasions, it is inactive.

#### [3] Performativity – freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we should abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place. Thus, it is logically incoherent to justify the NC standard without first willing that we can pursue ends free from others.

#### [4] Analytical philosophy means anyone can generate offense under the framework with analytics without evidence – couple impacts

#### a) Accessibility – util disproportionately favors evidence-based debate which is what big schools with coaching staffs have which kills small school engagement

#### b) Ground – it ensures that there’s always offense on both sides whereas util might skew against an uninherent aff because of what countries do

#### c) Critical thinking – ensures that you engage and contest offense instead of running to cards for argumentation

#### **[5]** Other frameworks collapse—they contain conditional obligations which derive their authority from the categorical imperative.

Korsgaard 98 [CHRISTINE M. KORSGAARD, 1998, “Introduction”, Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals] AG

This is the sort of thing that makes even practiced readers of Kant gnash their teeth. A rough translation might go like this: the categorical imperative is a law, to which our maxims must conform. But the reason they must do so cannot be that there is some further condition they must meet, or some other law to which they must conform. For instance, suppose someone proposed that one must keep one's promises because it is the will of God that one should do so - the law would then "contain the condition" that our maxims should conform to the will of God**.** This would yield only a conditional requirement to keep one's promises — if you would obey the will of God**, then** you must keep your promises - whereas the categorical imperative must give us an unconditional requirement. Since there can be no such condition, all that remains is that the categorical imperative should tell us that our maxims themselves must be laws - that is, that they must be universal, that being the characteristic of laws. There is a simpler way to make this point. What could make it true that we must keep our promises because it is the will of God? That would be true only if it were true that we must indeed obey the will of God, that is, if "obey the will of God" were itself a categorical imperative**.** Conditional requirements give rise to a regress; if there are unconditional requirements, we must at some point arrive at principles on which we are required to act, not because we are commanded to do so by some yet higher law, but because they are laws in themselves**.** The categorical imperative, in the most general sense, tells us to act on those principles, principles which are themselves laws.

### 1AC – Advocacy

#### Thus the advocacy – Resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.

Patents

International jurisdiction

### 1AC – Offense

#### [1] Intellectual property is coercive by restricting what people can do with their property

Krawisz 9 [Krawisz, Daniel. “The Fallacy of Intellectual Property.” Mises Institute, 8 Aug. 2009, mises.org/library/fallacy-intellectual-property.//dhs NJ]

Intellectual property is the principle that the creator of an idea has a right to certain controls over all the physical forms in which his idea is recorded. The extent of this control may be different depending on whether the idea is considered copyrighted, patented, or trademarked, but the essential principle is the same in all cases.[1] This presumed right of the creator of an idea is often believed to be similar to the right that a homesteader has to land he has settled, but the analogy is false. Intellectual property is necessarily a statist doctrine. The Nature of Property People cannot be expected to agree unanimously on what the world ought to be like and what each person should do, nor are people necessarily coordinated and patient enough to arrive at a consensus through deliberation. Instead they will tend to be apart from one another, desiring immediate action and lacking established procedures of efficiently coming to decisions. When people disagree and are unwilling to deliberate, one person's decision must prevail without regard to the others' desires. Whose decision prevails may be determined in two ways: physical conflict, or deferral to a system of property. With a system of property in place, it is necessary only to ask who owns a thing, rather than to endure the costs of deliberation or to resort to violence. Without the possibility of two persons attempting to control any one thing, defining property rights would be a mere psychological game without any consequences for human action. If persons were bodiless ghosts able to pass through one another without interacting, or if everyone lived in his own universe without being able to move from one to another, all disagreements about what to do with the world would be irrelevant. The purpose of property rights is the prevention of physical conflict. An essential characteristic of property is exclusivity, meaning that the use of an object by one person prevents it from being used by another.[2] In addition to property rights, political theorists have proposed many other kinds of rights. All such rights must resolve into rights over physical things. When we speak of a right to free speech or a right to one's labor, for example, we really mean a right over one's own physical body. All rights, therefore, are ultimately property rights. Ultimately, though we might speak of ownership over abstract things, it is only physical things, which can actually be fought over, that are owned. This we must keep in mind, for it is possible to sound reasonable and humane when discussing in abstract terms rights that would sound monstrous if they were described in terms of property. Libertarians have often noted, for example, that the "right" to health care, a job, or a minimum income implies a property right over the people capable of providing such things and is therefore really a form of slavery. Similarly, the right to a vote is really a joint ownership between all citizens over the people, land, and everything else within a particular jurisdiction. Libertarians themselves are at times confused over this issue. For example, they sometimes claim that in a free market broadcast industry, broadcasters would own certain frequencies in a given region and would therefore have the right to broadcast without interference by a pirate radio station on the same frequency. Yet it is clearly not the frequency that is owned, because a frequency is not a physical object but rather an abstract property of all waves. It is the land over which that frequency is broadcast that is owned, albeit only for the purposes of broadcasting that frequency. Ownership of a radio frequency is ultimately a property right over a region of space, which allows someone to broadcast at a given frequency over it.[3] This example demonstrates that ownership is not necessarily over entire objects but rather over decisions to be made with regard to them. An object can be owned by many different people because there are many kinds of decisions that can be made about it. Since different frequencies of radio waves can pass through one another without interfering, the same territory can be owned separately for the purposes of broadcasting at each frequency without leading to a conflict.[4] Ideas cannot themselves be controlled with physical force, but instead must be controlled by way of other things — paper, printing presses, computers, and people. It is therefore in these things that intellectual property consists. To own a patent in a given invention is to have rights over everything in the universe that might be used to replicate that invention. This ownership is limited; one only owns things to the extent of being able to prevent others from arranging them in a particular way. Similarly, to have a copyright in a song or a book is to have a property right over all paper, printing presses, computers — even over all people — everywhere. The owner may prevent the copying or public performance of his work by them all. Intellectual property is, like socialism, a kind of slavery, albeit a limited kind. Unlike socialism, however, intellectual property does not limit itself to the people and property in a given town or nation, or even the entire world. Since most matter in the universe could be used to encode an idea, intellectual property is a claim over the entire universe. "Intellectual property is necessarily a statist doctrine." Rather than seeing intellectual property as a particularly expansive kind of physical property, many people see it as a separate, analogous, and equally fundamental construction. To copy an intellectual work is therefore a form of theft analogous to burglary; however, I insist that there is no analogy. Intellectual property and physical property cannot exist side-by-side as logically independent legal constructions. Anything that gives control over physical things necessarily limits others' control of those things, and therefore acts exactly like a physical property right. If you have an intellectual property right to your monograph, you may prevent me from copying it, thereby limiting the physical property right I have in my ink, pen, and paper.

#### [2] IP rights prevent certain people from receiving the fruits of their mental labor.

Lindsey and Teles 17 [Ricketts, M. (2018). The Captured Economy: How the Powerful Enrich Themselves, Slow Down Growth, and Increase Inequality by Brink Lindsey and Steven M. Teles. Oxford University Press (2017), 221 pp. ISBN: 978-0190627768 (hb, £16.99). Economic Affairs, 38(2), 297–300. doi:10.1111/ecaf.12299]//Lex AKu recut Lex VM

In our opinion, the biggest problem with the moral case for patents and copyright laws is that those laws as currently constituted regularly violate the principle on which they are supposedly grounded—namely, entitlement to the fruits of one’s mental labor. The exclusive rights granted to copyright and patent holders aren’t just an additional premium layer of protection on top of the basic rights that all enjoy. Rather, copyright and patent laws extend premium rights to some in a way that frequently restricts the basic rights of others. Perversely, copyright and patent laws are regularly used to stop people from producing or selling their own original works. This was not always the case with copyright. Originally, US law prohibited only simple copying of full works as originally published. Thus, translations and even abridgments were not considered infringing. Gradually, the concept of infringement expanded to cover so-called derivative works—for example, a play based on a book, or a book that contains characters created by another author. This expansion was checked, to a limited and uncertain extent, by the concurrent rise of the doctrine of “fair use.” According to this doctrine, some derivative works—parodies, for example, and books that include brief quoted passages from other works—are not considered infringing. For everything else, including adaptations of an artistic work to a new format, new works using existing literary characters or settings, remixes or mashups of musical works, and so forth, the restrictions and penalties of copyright apply. In all these cases, artists can expend mental effort to create something new and original, but they are not allowed to publish or sell it.33 They are thus deprived of their basic rights to the fruits of their own mental labor. In the case of patent law, independent invention has never been a defense against claims of infringement. As a result, inventors who come in second in a patent race have no right at all to make use of and profit from their ideas. This is by no means an unusual occurrence, for nearly simultaneous and completely independent discovery of new technologies occurs with astonishing frequency.34 Indeed, patent infringement lawsuits only rarely involve intentional copying of someone else’s invention; in the clear majority of lawsuits, the alleged infringers developed their products on their own and weren’t even aware of the patent in question. In summary, the moral case for patents and copyright is supposedly based on the entitlement to enjoy the fruits of one’s mental labor. Yet under current law, the most basic and universal form that this entitlement can take, one whose general propriety is completely uncontroversial, is regularly traduced. We therefore find unconvincing the claim that copyright and patent holders are rightful property owners who are only receiving their just due. Yes, we can imagine intellectual property laws in which the moral claims for exclusive rights are much stronger. If copyright were limited to its original concern of preventing sales of full reproductions, and if patents were awarded to all independent co-inventors (or at least independent invention were a complete defense in any infringement action), then intellectual property rights would indeed provide additional protections for artists and inventors without impinging on the basic rights of other artists and inventors. But that is not the intellectual property law we have today, and to get there would require major statutory changes. The copyright and patent laws we have today therefore look more like intellectual monopoly than intellectual property. They do not simply give people their rightful due; on the contrary, they regularly deprive people of their rightful due. If there is a case to be made for the special privileges granted under these laws, it must be based on utilitarian grounds. As we have already seen, that case is surprisingly weak, and utterly incapable of justifying the radical expansion in IP protection that has occurred in recent years. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate to strip IP protection of its sheep’s clothing and to see it for the wolf it is, a major source of economic stagnation and a tool for unjust enrichment.

#### [3] IP Rights hand partial control of others property to IP Creators.

Kinsella 13 [Kinsella S. (2013) The Case Against Intellectual Property. In: Luetge C. (eds) Handbook of the Philosophical Foundations of Business Ethics. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1494-6\_99]//Lex AKu recut Lex VM \*\*\*Brackets for Gendered Language\*\*\*

Let us recall that IP rights give to pattern-creators partial rights of control – ownership – over the material property of everyone else. The pattern-creator has partial ownership of others’ property, by virtue of his [their] IP right, because he [they] can prohibit them from performing certain actions with their own property. Author X, for example, can prohibit a third party, Y, from inscribing a certain pattern of words on Y’s own blank pages with Y’s own ink. That is, by merely authoring an original expression of ideas, by merely thinking of and recording some original pattern of information, or by finding a new way to use his own property (recipe), the IP creator instantly, magically becomes a partial owner of others’ property. He [They] has some say over how third parties can use their property. He is granted, in effect, a type of “negative servitude” in others’ already owned property” (See [32]). IP rights change the status quo by redistributing property from individuals of one class (material-property owners) to individuals of another (authors and inventors). Prima facie, therefore, IP law trespasses against or “takes” the property of material-property owners, by transferring partial ownership to authors and inventors. It is this invasion and redistribution of property that must be justified in order for IP rights to be valid. We see, then, that utilitarian defenses do not do the trick. Further problems with natural-rights defenses are explored below.

#### [4] Justifying ownership based on creation is unjust.

Kinsella 13 [Kinsella S. (2013) The Case Against Intellectual Property. In: Luetge C. (eds) Handbook of the Philosophical Foundations of Business Ethics. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1494-6\_99]//Lex AKu recut Lex VM

One problem with the creation-based approach is that it almost invariably protects only certain types of creations – unless, i.e., every single useful idea one comes up with is subject to ownership (more on this below). But the distinction between the protectable and the unprotectable is necessarily arbitrary. For example, philosophical or mathematical or scientific truths cannot be protected under current law on the grounds that commerce and social intercourse would grind to a halt were every new phrase, philosophical truth, and the like considered the exclusive property of its creator. For this reason, patents can be obtained only for so-called practical applications of ideas, but not for more abstract or theoretical ideas. Rand agrees with this disparate treatment, in attempting to distinguish between an unpatentable discovery and a patentable invention. She argues that a “scientific or philosophical discovery, which identifies a law of nature, a principle, or a fact of reality not previously known” is not created by the discoverer. But the distinction between creation and discovery is not clear-cut or rigorous.31 Nor is it clear why such a distinction, even if clear, is ethically relevant in defining property rights. No one creates matter; they just manipulate and grapple with it according to physical laws. In this sense, no one really creates anything. They merely rearrange matter into new arrangements and patterns. An engineer who invents a new mousetrap has rearranged existing parts to provide a function not previously performed [90]. Others who learn of this new arrangement can now also make an improved mousetrap. Yet the mousetrap merely follows laws of nature. The inventor did not invent the matter out of which the mousetrap is made, nor the facts and laws exploited to make it work. Similarly, Einstein’s “discovery” of the relation E = mc2 , once known by others, allows them to manipulate matter in a more efficient way. Without Einstein’s, or the inventor’s, efforts, others would have been ignorant of certain causal laws, of ways matter can be manipulated and utilized. Both the inventor and the theoretical scientist engage in creative mental effort to produce useful, new ideas. Yet one is rewarded, and the other is not. In one recent case, the inventor of a new way to calculate a number representing the shortest path between two points – an extremely useful technique – was not given patent protection because this was “merely” a mathematical algorithm.32 But it is arbitrary and unfair to reward more practical inventors and entertainment providers, such as the engineer and songwriter, and to leave more theoretical science and math researchers and philosophers unrewarded. The distinction is inherently vague, arbitrary, and unjust.

#### [5] IP is not reflective of true ownership and doesn’t meet a priori truth.

Lindsey Teles 17 [Lindsey, Brink, and Teles, Steven M.. The Captured Economy: How the Powerful Enrich Themselves, Slow Down Growth, and Increase Inequality. United States, Oxford University Press, 2017 //Lex Aku and JB]

In our opinion, the biggest problem with the moral case for patents and copyright laws is that those laws as currently constituted regularly violate the principle on which they are supposedly grounded—namely, entitlement to the fruits of one’s mental labor. The exclusive rights granted to copyright and patent holders aren’t just an additional premium layer of protection on top of the basic rights that all enjoy. Rather, copyright and patent laws extend premium rights to some in a way that frequently restricts the basic rights of others. Perversely, copyright and patent laws are regularly used to stop people from producing or selling their own original works. This was not always the case with copyright. Originally, US law prohibited only simple copying of full works as originally published. Thus, translations and even abridgments were not considered infringing. Gradually, the concept of infringement expanded to cover so-called derivative works—for example, a play based on a book, or a book that contains characters created by another author. This expansion was checked, to a limited and uncertain extent, by the concurrent rise of the doctrine of “fair use.” According to this doctrine, some derivative works—parodies, for example, and books that include brief quoted passages from other works—are not considered infringing. For everything else, including adaptations of an artistic work to a new format, new works using existing literary characters or settings, remixes or mashups of musical works, and so forth, the restrictions and penalties of copyright apply. In all these cases, artists can expend mental effort to create something new and original, but they are not allowed to publish or sell it.33 They are thus deprived of their basic rights to the fruits of their own mental labor. In the case of patent law, independent invention has never been a defense against claims of infringement. As a result, inventors who come in second in a patent race have no right at all to make use of and profit from their ideas. This is by no means an unusual occurrence, for nearly simultaneous and completely independent discovery of new technologies occurs with astonishing frequency.34 Indeed, patent infringement lawsuits only rarely involve intentional copying of someone else’s invention; in the clear majority of lawsuits, the alleged infringers developed their products on their own and weren’t even aware of the patent in question. In summary, the moral case for patents and copyright is supposedly based on the entitlement to enjoy the fruits of one’s mental labor. Yet under current law, the most basic and universal form that this entitlement can take, one whose general propriety is completely uncontroversial, is regularly traduced. We therefore find unconvincing the claim that copyright and patent holders are rightful property owners who are only receiving their just due. Yes, we can imagine intellectual property laws in which the moral claims for exclusive rights are much stronger. If copyright were limited to its original concern of preventing sales of full reproductions, and if patents were awarded to all independent co-inventors (or at least independent invention were a complete defense in any infringement action), then intellectual property rights would indeed provide additional protections for artists and inventors without impinging on the basic rights of other artists and inventors. But that is not the intellectual property law we have today, and to get there would require major statutory changes. The copyright and patent laws we have today therefore look more like intellectual monopoly than intellectual property. They do not simply give people their rightful due; on the contrary, they regularly deprive people of their rightful due. If there is a case to be made for the special privileges granted under these laws, it must be based on utilitarian grounds. As we have already seen, that case is surprisingly weak, and utterly incapable of justifying the radical expansion in IP protection that has occurred in recent years. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate to strip IP protection of its sheep’s clothing and to see it for the wolf it is, a major source of economic stagnation and a tool for unjust enrichment.

### 1AC – Method

#### [1] Trivialism

**Kabay 08** [Paul Douglas Kabay, (PhD thesis, School of Philosophy, Anthropology, and Social Inquiry) "A Defense Of Trivialism" The University Of Melbourne, 2008, https://minerva-access.unimelb.edu.au/handle/11343/35203, DOA:10-25-2017]

Let us define a trivial entity as an entity that instantiates every predicate, i.e. an entity of which **everything is true.** One of the things true of **a trivial entity** is that it **exists in a reality in which trivialism is true. Hence, if a trivial entity exists, then trivialism is true.** But is it true that there exists a trivial entity? Here is an argument for thinking that it is true: **1) Every being (or entity or object) is either trivial or nontrivial 2) It is not the case that every being is nontrivial 3) Hence, there exists a trivial being**

#### [2] Negating affirms because it assumes that the 1AC is a statement that is worthy of contestation which means our arguments are legitimate.

#### [3] There are infinite worlds, the aff is true in one which is sufficient.

**Vaidman 2** Vaidman, Lev, 3-24-2002, "Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," No Publication, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qm-manyworlds/>

-MWI: Multiple Worlds Interpretation

**The reason for adopting the MWI is that it avoids the collapse of the quantum wave.** (Other non-collapse theories are not better than MWI for various reasons, e.g., nonlocality of Bohmian mechanics; and the disadvantage of all of them is that they have some additional structure.) **The collapse postulate is a physical law that differs from all known physics in two aspects: it is genuinely random and it involves some kind of action at a distance**. According to the collapse postulate the outcome of a **quantum experiment is not determined by the initial conditions** of the Universe prior to the experiment: **only the probabilities are governed by the initial state**. Moreover, Bell 1964 has shown that there cannot be a compatible local-variables theory that will make deterministic predictions**. There is no experimental evidence in favor of collapse and against the MWI.**

#### [4] What the neg reads doesn’t prove the aff false but only challenges an assumption of it

#### [5] All neg interps are counter interps since the aff takes an implicit stance on every issue

### 1AC – UV

#### [1] 1ar theory since the neg can do infinite bad things and I can’t check. The 1NC can’t set paradigm issues for 1AR theory – it should be contextual

#### [2] Permissibility and presumption substantively affirm: a) Statements are true before false since if I told you my name, you’d believe me b) Interpretation – The negative must grant the aff presumption or permissibility. A violation would be reading both or contesting one [1] Strat skew – otherwise it incentivizes the 1n to read multiple NIBs and frontload the 1n with presumption and permissibility offense which is particularly bad since there isn’t a substantive truth to either side

#### [3] No omissions: All neg theory violations and kritik links must come from the text of the AC, not the absence of specification. (A) I have a limited time to speak so it’s an infinite aff burden (B) Race to bottom – incentivizes people to not engage the aff and make a bunch frivolous spec argument to preclude

#### [4] Neg may only read 1 T or theory shell. Multiple shells spread out the 1AR and allow the 2NR to collapse to whichever shell was under covered, meaning I wasn’t given a fair shot at justifying my practice. Multiple rounds solve your offense since we can check lots of abusive practices over time.

#### [5] Aff gets RVIs a) time skew: theory moots all aff offense and the 1ar isn’t enough time to win on both substance and theory so the 2n collapse makes it impossible, and given bidirectional interps, theory is always a 2nd off strategy for you

#### [6] The Negative has won more rounds at this tournament, and wins more rounds overall, so the affirmative is justified in being unfair insofar as it balances out side bias B) contesting aff spikes is incoherent because there’s infinite framing we can have but default aff because it stops regression c) theory on spikes is paradoxical because both of them equally indict each other

#### [7] Aff theory comes lexically prior A) affirming is harder so we need an advantage B) otherwise they can collapse to one shell for 6 minutes in the 2NR and not even touch mine, aff theory coming first forces them to clash with theory C) they have 13 minutes that they can spend on theory and I only have 7 so Aff theory must come first to check back time skew