#### Interp: The affirmative must defend the resolution: Resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.

#### Violation: they defend elimination of enforcement of patent protections for medicines in every nation except the United States, the United Kingdom, Belgium, The Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, France, Spain, China, Japan

#### Standards

#### Limits – the resolution is the only thing that defines our prep burdens. Their interp incentivizes affirmatives to be as far from the resolution as possible to minimize the negative’s ability to engage – outweighs since that controls the internal link to clash since you could moot all my pre-round prep, which puts me at a structural disadvantage going into the round. All other limits are arbitrary and would favor the aff in terms of literature bases leading to a structural skew. That means we should presume all of your arguments false since I couldn’t have been expected to have the prep to contest it, so it hasn’t been subject to any scrutiny – also means they can’t weigh case.

#### Switch side debate – if your stance doesn’t affirm, you can read it on the negative which solves all your offense. A limited topic forces us to contest our beliefs from different angles which controls the internal link to advocacy skills since it forces you to scrutinize your own beliefs, which spills over and makes real world change. Undermining switch-side debate forces me to argue for terrible norms since you could affirm “racism is bad” and I would have to argue against it, which is an independent reason to drop them since it creates psychological violence for minority debaters and invites violent arguments in the debate space.

#### TVA – all your offense links to whole res, solves all your offense

#### Fairness: it’s constitutive of activities with wins and losses

#### Education – it’s the only reason school fund debate and host tournaments

#### DTD – a) deter future abuse and set norms b) my strat has already been skewed c) dropping the arg on T is nonsensical since we indict your whole advocacy

#### CI: a) reasonability arbirtrary and causes judge intervention since we don’t know you abuse meter b) creates a race to the top where we set the best norms for debate c) topicality is question of models of debate which they should have to proactively justify

#### No RVIS a) illogical – you don’t win for proving you’re fair b) incentivizze baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to abusive practices c) creates a chilling effect where people are scared to check real abuse
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#### Morality must be derived a priori:

#### 2] Uncertainty – inability to know others’ experience due to a limited perception makes empiricism unreliable for universal ethics.

#### 3] Verification – The logic of evaluating consequences is circular because it relies on the assumption that nature will hold uniform but we could only reach that conclusion through an observation of past events.

#### 4] The is-ought fallacy – Naturalistic frameworks fail to derive an imperative to act. That is, even if you win pleasure biologically valuable, your framework doesn’t answer why we have a moral obligation to follow biology without appealing to a higher-order framework.

#### Ethics must answer “why should I follow this” else people could opt out of it and be skeptics. Only reason solves:

#### 1] Inescapability – asking why reason is important cedes authority to reason itself – it’s constitutive of our agency

#### 2] Action Theory – Every action can be broken down to infinite amounts of movements, i.e. me moving my arm can be broken down to every state my arm is in. Only reason can unify these movements because we use practical reason to achieve our goals, means all actions collapse to reason

#### Thus the standard is consistency with universalizibility. If the constitutive principle of agency is merely agency, then any valid practical judgment must be true of every practical agent and for every agent. Our judgements are authoritative and can’t apply to only ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me, which makes noncontradiction a constraint.

#### Performativity – Argumentation presupposes one’s own freedom to act – if I violated your freedom, you wouldn’t be able to debate – this means contestations of my framework prove it true

#### Consequentialism fails

#### B] Predictions impossible – there is so non-arbitrary cutoff to calculations when analyzes the effects of actions. When one action is done, that results in an infinite of other chain events which eventually makes any two actions the same.

#### C] no way to evaluate predictions –there is no reason for why past trends continue – that is justified by experiencing the fact that past trends continue which is in it itself a past trend

#### D] Aggregation impossible – multiple chemicals in the brain can make me happy. No way to compare them.

#### Theoretical justifications - A) Resource disparities—a focus on evidence privileges debaters with the most prep. A Kantian debate can be won without prep since only analytics are required. Controls the internal link to other voters because accessibility is a pre-req, B) Real world education—an understanding of Kant is key to understanding law in the real world because most states abide by inviolable side-constraints in their constitutions—Germany proves.

#### Ripstein 09 (Arthur Ripstein Force and Freedom: Kant's Legal and Political Philosophy. Harvard University Press, 2009.).

#### The German Constitutional Court’s reasoning reflects the underlying Kantian thought that the state’s obligation to uphold a rightful condition and protect its citizens is unconditional, not simply because of some fond- ness for rules, but rather because the use of force is merely unilateral un- less its authorization could proceed from an omnilateral will. People could only give themselves laws consistent with their innate right of humanity. As a result, the numbers cannot matter. If the state cannot order a person to stand in the path of a bullet that endangers an innocent person, it cannot order that person to stand in the path of a bullet that endangers many people. And if the state cannot order a person to do so, then it can- not exempt itself from such a prohibition in the case of a person who is likely to die anyway. The People give themselves laws not for their advantage, but for their independence, which they cannot trade against any- thing.

#### Oppression is caused by arbitrary exclusion of others – only universalizability makes sure that include everyone equally

**Farr 02** [Arnold Farr (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.]

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**.

### Offense

#### [1] Intellectual property is part of our metaphysical construction that preserves agency – anything else robs us of innate property

Pozzo 06 [Riccardo Pozzo, Immanuel Kant sobre propriedade intelectual. Trans/Form/Ação, (São Paulo), v.29(2), 2006, p.11-18, <https://www.scielo.br/j/trans/a/rLfb3yPN3p4KPsYpxp8LQCp/?format=pdf&lang=en> // JB]

The peculiarity of intellectual property consists thus first in being indeed a property, but property of an action; and second in being indeed inalienable, but also transferable in commission and license to a publisher. The bond the author has on his work confers him a moral right that is indeed a personal right. It is also a right to exploit economically his work in all possible ways, a right of economic use, which is a patrimonial right. Kant and Fichte argued that moral right and the right of economic use are strictly connected, and that the offense to one implies inevitably offense to the other. In eighteenth-century Germany, the free use came into discussion among the presuppositions of a democratic renewal of state and society. In his Supplement to the Consideration of Publishing and Its Rights, Reimarus asked writers “instead of writing for the aristocracy, to write for the tiers état of the reader’s world.” (Reimarus, 1791b, p.595). He saluted with enthusiasm the claim of disenfranchising from the monopoly of English publishers expressed in the American Act for the Encouragement of Learning of May 31, 1790. Kant, however, was firm in embracing intellectual property. Referring himself to Roman Law, he asked for its legislative formulation not only as patrimonial right, but also as a personal right. In Of the Illegitimity of Pirate Publishing, he considered the moral faculties related to intellectual property as an “inalienable right (ius personalissimum) always himself to speak through anyone else, the right, that is, that no one may deliver the same speech to the public other than in his (the author’s) name” (Kant, 1902, t.8, p.85). Fichte went farther in the Demonstration of the Illegitimity of Pirate Publishing. He saw intellectual property as a part of his metaphysical construction of intellectual activity, which was based on the principle that thoughts “are not transmitted hand to hand, they are not paid with shining cash, neither are they transmitted to us if we take home the book that contains them and put it into our library. In order to make those thoughts our own an action is still missing: we must read the book, meditate – provided it is not completely trivial – on its content, consider it under different aspects and eventually accept it within our connections of ideas” (Fichte, 1964, t.I/1, p.411).

#### Reducing IP is a form of free-riding that fails the universality test, but also uses the creators of the medicine as means to an end.

Dyke 18 Dyke, Raymond. “The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting - IPWatchdog.com: Patents &amp; Patent Law.” IPWatchdog.com | Patents &amp; Patent Law, 1 Oct. 2018, www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/.//dhsNJ

As we shall see, applying Kantian logic entails first acknowledging some basic principles; that the people have a right to express themselves, that that expression (the fruits of their labor) has value and is theirs (unless consent is given otherwise), and that government is obligated to protect people and their property. Thus, an inventor or creator has a right in their own creation, which cannot be taken from them without their consent. So, employing this canon, a proposed Categorical Imperative (CI) is the following Statement: creators should be protected against the unlawful taking of their creation by others. Applying this Statement to everyone, i.e., does the Statement hold water if everyone does this, leads to a yes determination. Whether a child, a book or a prototype, creations of all sorts should be protected, and this CI stands. This result also dovetails with the purpose of government: to protect the people and their possessions by providing laws to that effect, whether for the protection of tangible or intangible things. However, a contrary proposal can be postulated: everyone should be able to use the creations of another without charge. Can this Statement rise to the level of a CI? This proposal, upon analysis would also lead to chaos. Hollywood, for example, unable to protect their films, television shows or any content, would either be out of business or have robust encryption and other trade secret protections, which would seriously undermine content distribution and consumer enjoyment. Likewise, inventors, unable to license or sell their innovations or make any money to cover R&D, would not bother to invent or also resort to strong trade secret. Why even create? This approach thus undermines and greatly hinders the distribution of ideas in a free society, which is contrary to the paradigm of the U.S. patent and copyright systems, which promotes dissemination. By allowing freeriding, innovation and creativity would be thwarted (or at least not encouraged) and trade secret protection would become the mainstay for society with the heightened distrust.