# 1nc

## 1st

### T

#### Interpretation: the affirmative debater must specify which member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines

#### Violation: they didn’t specify

#### Standards:

#### 1] Real world ed – they broadly generalize that IPPs are going to be reduced in all countries without specifying the conditions and situations of certain countries and how that affects the resolution, which means we cannot talk about the nuances of it since the aff has already determined the direction of the round, which is also k2 clash. OW on portability b/c we are able to use we learn and apply it years from now.

#### 2] Stable advocacy – 1AR clarification delinks neg positions that prove why certain nations shouldn’t reduce IPPs by saying it isn’t their method of implementation – wrecks neg ballot access and kills in depth clash – CX doesn’t check since it kills 1NC construction pre-round

#### Paradigm issues

#### Fairness voter, a] in reading any argument, you presuppose the judge is evaluating it fairly in the first place, b] debate is a competitive activity that requires fair evaluation

#### Drop the debater – 1. Deterrence – Prevents reading the abusive practice in the future since it’s not worth risking the loss which is k2 norm setting indefensible practices die out f 3. Epistemic Skew – The round has already been skewed so it’s impossible to evaluate the rest of the flow

#### Competing interps – 1. Reasonability encourages a race to the margins of what counts as sufficiently fair which incentivizes as much abuse as possible 2. Norm setting – it encourages the most fair rule through debating competing models

#### No RVIs – 1. Baiting – incentivizes people to be abusive and script counter-interps to win on the RVI which increases the existence of bad norms 2. Logic – you shouldn’t win for proving you were fair

#### 1NC theory first – a] If I was abusive it was because the 1AC was b] We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea,

#### No new 1ar paradigm issues - A] the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense -- --- also means no new 1ar fwk justifications because the 1nc occurred without having them which also moots my offense AND its irreciprocal since I only have 1 speech to read a fw

#### Reject 1ar theory

## 2nd

### nc

#### Permissibility and presumption negate – Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false – outweighs on probability. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

#### I value morality.

#### Ethics must be derived from the constitutive features of agents – ethics based internally fail because they can’t generate universal obligations and ethics based externally fail because they are nonbinding as agents could opt-out and have no motivation to follow them which means they fail to guide action.

#### Constitutivism solves – it allows for universal obligations among all agents but they are binding and cannot be opted out of. Thus, the meta ethic is constitutivism.

#### Next, only practical reason is constitutive:

#### [1] Regress – practical reason is inescapable because when you question why you should use practical reason, you are using reason itself. Anything else is infinitely regressive and nonbinding because you can always ask “why should I do that” continuously without any terminal justification. Bindingness is required in morality; otherwise people could opt out of it and have no moral guidance.

#### Next, practical reason means we all have a unified perspective: What can be justified to me can be justified to everyone who is a practical reasoner. If I can conclude that 2+2 is 4, then I understand not only that I know 2+2 is 4, but that everyone around me can arrive at the same conclusion

#### A priori truth has to apply to everyone: A) absent universal ethics, morality becomes arbitrary and fails to guide action, which means that ethics is rendered useless, B) otherwise it creates a contradiction in which you justify your freedom while limiting others’

#### Thus the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Prefer additionally:

#### 1] 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

#### 2] Consequentialism fails - a] induction fails: the logic of looking into the past to predict the future is predicated on past experiences, meaning it’s circular, b] butterfly effect: every consequence is infinitely cascading so we don’t know the true extent of our actions, meaning we cannot predict consequences

#### [2] Only univeralizable reason can effectively explain the perspectives of agents – that’s the best method for combatting oppression.

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 **criticism**s **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.**

### Offense

#### Negate:

#### [1] The aff violates the categorical imperative and is non-universalizable- governments have a binding obligation to protect creations

**Van Dyke 18** Raymond Van Dyke, 7-17-2018, "The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting," IPWatchdog, <https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/> SJ//DA recut SJKS

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

#### [2] The aff encourages free riding- that treats people as ­means to an end and takes advantage of their efforts which violates the principle of humanity

**Van Dyke 18** Raymond Van Dyke, 7-17-2018, "The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting," IPWatchdog, <https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/> SJ//DA recut SJKS

Also, **allowing the free taking of ideas, content and valuable data, i.e., the fruits of individual intellectual endeavor**, would disrupt capitalism in a radical way. **The resulting more secretive approach in support of the above free-riding Statement** would be akin to a Communist environment **where the State owned everything and the citizen owned nothing, i.e., the people “consented” to this. It is, accordingly, manifestly clear that no reasonable and supportable Categorical Imperative can be made for the unwarranted theft of property, whether tangible or intangible,** apart from legitimate exigencies.

## 3rd

### cp

#### Counterplan: The member nations of the world trade organization ought to decolonize

Tuck and Yang 2 [Eve and K. Wayne; “Decolonization is not a metaphor” in Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society; State University of New York at New Paltz and UC San Diego; LCA-BP]

*Despite the rise of publicly traded prisons, Farms are not fundamentally capitalist ventures; at their core, they are colonial contract institutions much like Spanish Missions, Indian Boarding Schools, and ghetto school systems26. The labor to cage black bodies is paid for by the state and then land is granted, worked by convict labor, to generate additional profits for the prison proprietors. However, it is the management of excess presence on the land, not the forced labor, that is the main object of slavery under settler colonialism. Today, 85% of people incarcerated at Angola, die there.* An ethic of incommensurability, which guides moves that unsettle innocence, stands in contrast to aims of reconciliation, which motivate settler moves to innocence. Reconciliation is about rescuing settler normalcy, about rescuing a settler future. Reconciliation is concerned with questions of what will decolonization look like? What will happen after *abolition? What will be the consequences of decolonization for the settler?* Incommensurability acknowledges that these questions need not, and perhaps cannot, be answered in order for decolonization to exist as a framework. We want to say, first, that decolonization is not obliged to answer those questions - decolonization is not accountable to settlers, or settler futurity. Decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity. Still, we acknowledge the questions of those wary participants in Occupy Oakland and other settlers who want to know what decolonization will require of them. The answers are not fully in view and can’t be as long as decolonization remains punctuated by metaphor. The answers will not emerge from friendly understanding, and indeed require a dangerous understanding of uncommonality that un-coalesces coalition politics - moves that may feel very unfriendly. But we will find out the answers as we get there, “in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give [decolonization] historical form and content” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). To fully enact an ethic of incommensurability means relinquishing settler futurity, abandoning the hope that settlers may one day be commensurable to Native peoples. It means removing the asterisks, periods, commas, apostrophes, the whereas’s, buts, and conditional clauses that punctuate decolonization and underwrite settler innocence. The Native futures, the lives to be lived once the settler nation is gone - these are the unwritten possibilities made possible by an ethic of incommensurability. *when you take away the punctuation* he says of lines lifted from the documents about military-occupied land its acreage and location *you take away its finality opening the possibility of other futures* -Craig Santos Perez, Chamoru scholar and poet (as quoted by Voeltz, 2012) Decolonization offers a different perspective to human and civil rights based approaches to justice, an unsettling one, rather than a complementary one. Decolonization is not an “and”. It is an elsewhere.

#### Competes through net-benefits

#### No Perms – 1. Ground – They’re severance since the aff now defends something that is different from the explicit text in the 1ac which kills all neg ground since they can shift to whatever the 1n defends making it impossible to debate 2. Logic – They flow neg since it concedes the CP is a better idea than the aff 3. Advocacy skills – Perms allow shifting advocacies that never force the aff to defend their position against scrutiny which kills any education from having substance debates 4. Textually and functionally competitive – it explicitly defends something that isn’t the aff and requires the affs funding.

## Case