## 1

#### Permissibility Negates –

#### [1] Semantics –

#### [2] Safety –

#### [3] Logic –

#### Now Negate –

#### 1] member[[1]](#footnote-1) is “a part or organ of the body, especially a limb” but an organ can’t have obligations

#### 2] of[[2]](#footnote-2) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 3] the[[3]](#footnote-3) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

#### 4] to[[4]](#footnote-4) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### 5] reduce[[5]](#footnote-5) is to “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.

#### 6] for[[6]](#footnote-6) is “in place of” but medicines aren’t replacing IP.

#### 7] medicine[[7]](#footnote-7) is “(especially among some North American Indian peoples) a spell, charm, or fetish believed to have healing, protective, or other power” but you can’t have IP for a spell.

#### 8] Trade means “a publication intended for persons in the entertainment business”(Merriam Webster) but a world entertainment business cannot reduce intellectual property making the resolution incoherent.

#### 9] Intellectual is defined as “possessing or showing intellect or mental compacity” (Dictionary.com) but property cant possess intellect so the resolutions incoherent

#### 10] Property means “a building” (Oxford Languages) so reducing intellectual buildings is incoherent

## 2

#### Theory is incoherent: [a] The ballot is always determined off abuse and inequalities, otherwise it would be impossible to evaluate the round. [b] You can’t evaluate theory because it’s evaluating off the flow rather than making the decision of which is actually a better norm, so you can’t actually be consistent with the voters. [c] Theory doesn’t produce the best rule since it allows the better theory debater to produce rules that will benefit them. [d] Things get proven true in debate rounds all the time that aren’t true in the real world, so theory doesn't actually achieve its purpose because it doesn’t prove better norms. [e] It’s a contradiction because you say your voter is either constitutive of or beneficial for a competitive activity, but no competitive activity would establish rules in the middle of a competition. [f] Theory sets bad norms because we vote for interps that are marginally better than other interps, rather the best version of the interp, so it doesn’t achieve the voter. [g] Theory is paradoxical because it attempts to limit arguments but uses arguments to do that, which concedes the validity of arguments in the first place. [h] Not jurisdictional because the judge can only vote for someone proving their side of the resolution. The resolution doesn’t care about whether we can debate, it just says prove your side, so theory isn’t a voter.

## 3

#### Kant is Homophobic: This isn’t an ad hominem but the logical conclusion of his philosophy. Being gay is a contradiction in conception, since if everyone had homosexual intercourse, their would be no reproduction. Kant believes this is sex without function, requires sacrificing rational agency for the subordinate end of pleasure.
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Kant's Vorlesung treatment of its own species.75

#### And Kant’s conclusion is not just that homosexual intercourse is bad, but also that queer people literally are not human and can be killed with impunity.

**Soble 2**

Given what Kant claims about the meager status of the masturbator and homosexual, that they are below the beasts and no longer deserve to be persons, we would have expected a better treatment by him of the principle(s) by which these practices are to be so severely condemned. (I suppose Kant was led here mostly by emotional disgust at the crimina carnis contra naturam.) This failure to provide a more solid principled foundation for his judgments about sexual perversion is especially surprising, since Kant's intellectual gay-bashing is supplemented, in effect, by the advocation of physical gay-bashing [Quote Starts]: Man can only dispose over things; beasts are things in this sense; but man is not a thing, not a beast. If he disposes over himself, he treats his value as that of a beast. He who so behaves, who has no respect for human nature and makes a thing of himself, becomes for everyone an Object of freewill. We are free to treat him as a beast, as a thing, and to use him for our sport as we do a horse or a dog, for he is no longer a human being.89 We can dispose of things which have no freedom but not of a being which has free will. A man who sells himself makes himself a thing and, as he has jettisoned his person, it is open to anyone to deal with him as he pleases. Another instance of this kind is where a human being makes himself a thing by making himself an object of enjoyment for some one's sexual desire [Quote Ends].90 Kant's sadistic leitmotif permits if not encourages treating as lower than animals the animals or things that the masturbator and the homosexual, by their own deliberate choices, have become.
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