# 1NC vs BASIS Peoria PY

## 1

#### A. Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than “The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.,” then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)*

#### B. Violation:

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Fairness –

#### a) Ground –

#### b) Limits –

#### 2. Research –

## 2

#### 1] Interpretation: Debaters must send all constructive positions in an accessible format before they start their speech if asked to disclose accessibly

#### 2] Violation: They only disclose a copy of their documents with “cut” cards where they read the parts of evidence they have highlighted.

#### Instructions are clearly given on my wiki as well as a demand for the formatting.

#### 3] Standard: Accessibility –

#### A] Digital magnification limits the amount of on-screen text and requires copious amounts of horizontal and vertical scrolling making it difficult to track when not reading some text and simultaneously looking for the next highlighted section. B] Screen reader users read documents audibly, but there is no way to read only the tags and highlighted parts due to their formatting. C] Their formatting is inaccessible for those with disabilities like me because the parts of evidence that are not being read distract them from the parts being read.

## 3

#### The starting point of morality is practical reason –

#### And, reason must be universal –

#### Thus, counter-methodology: Vote negative to engage in a liberation strategy of universal reason –

#### Prefer:

#### Performativity: freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments through talking freely. Willing that we should abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place. Thus, denying self-ownership in the round automatically implies the truth of the aff framework.

#### Negate:

#### [1] Independently, Kant is incompatible with a your method – it requires unconditional respect for humanity as an end in itself.

Korsgaard 83 bracketed for gendered language (Christine M., “Two Distinctions in Goodness,” The Philosophical Review Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 169-195, JSTOR)

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] he or she 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 them. 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.

#### [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.**

#### [3] Independently not defending the topic is non-universalizable b/c if nobody defended the topic than a topic wouldn’t have even been created in the first place which is a contradiction in conception.

## 4

#### Their use of the term women instead of womxn reinforces hierarchies.

Caira Blignaut, OPINION: Womxn vs Women, March 24, 2018, <https://www.matiemedia.org/opinion-womxn-vs-women/> ///AHS PB

It has been a decades long debate of the fight for feminists to have their voices truly heard. One part of this is by taking autonomy over the very word that describes them as an independent and self-directed group within society. The spelling of the word ‘women’ as ‘womxn’ has surfaced over the last few years. The spelling comes from the fact that individuals and groups are choosing to spell the word this way because they feel the need to not be an extension to the word man. It is a form of self-reinvention. The idea behind the spelling of the word in this way is womxn being their own separate entity from that of a man. In its spelling, it indicates that the womxn is fully capable of operating as a single entity without the relief of a man. The word is also intersectional, “as it is meant to include transgender womxn, womxn of color, womxn from third world countries, and every other self-identifying womxn out there,” says Natalia Emmanual, from Washington University, who has also chosen to identify as a womxn. It can and most probably will be said that this minor change in the spelling of the word is unnecessary. That it holds no distinguished sanctions in the way society is set up in its patriarchal roots of misogyny and misrepresentation but I do feel like this micro- change is essential. It is vital in the depiction of the notoriously known ‘weaker sex’ in terms of representation and voice. This new spelling can lead to endless conversations and discourse that can be created not only for awareness but inclusion as well. Social media has slowly started adopting the spelling of the word in its new form. By doing this fellow womxn are perpetuating a space for education against dominant narratives to take place. By making others more aware of the spelling, it creates a space for another to be better informed on why some choose to spell womxn with an x.

#### Drop them to deter further sexist rhetoric in the debate space- they could have said womxn instead.

#### The safety of the space is prima facie – we don’t know who’s winning if people can’t engage. Anything that doesn’t immediately denounce atrocities excludes people who have and can experience them.

**Teehan** Ryan Teehan [NSD staffer and competitor from the Delbarton School] – NSD Update comment on the student protests at the TOC in 2014. //Massa

Honestly, I don't think that 99% of what has been said in this thread so far actually matters. It doesn't matter whether you think that these types of assumptions should be questioned. It doesn't matter what accepting this intuition could potentially do or not do. It doesn't matter if you see fit to make, incredibly trivializing and misplaced I might add, links between this and the Holocaust. **All** of the **arguments that talk about how debate is** a **unique** space for questioning assumptions **make an assumption of safety**. They say that this is a space where one is safe to question assumptions and try new perspectives. **That is not true** for everyone. **When we allow arguments that question the wrongness of racism, sexism, homophobia, rape**, lynching, etc., **we make debate unsafe for certain people. The idea that debate is a safe space to question all assumptions is** the definition of **privilege**, it begins with an idea of a debater that can question every assumption. **People who face the actual effects** of the aforementioned things **cannot question those assumptions, and making debate** a space **built around the idea that they can is hostile**. So, you really have a choice. Either 1) say that you do not want these people to debate so that you can let people question the wrongness of everything I listed before, 2) say that you care more about letting debaters question those things than making debate safe for everyone, or 3) make it so that saying things that make debate unsafe has actual repercussions. On "**debate is not the real world**". **Only for people who can separate their existence in "the real world" from their existence in debate.** That means privileged, white, heterosexual males like myself. I don't understand how you can make this sweeping claim when some people are clearly harmed by these arguments. **At the end of the day, you have to figure out whether you care about debate being safe for everyone** involved. I don't think anyone has contested that these arguments make debate unsafe for certain people**. If you care at all about the people involved in debate then don't vote on these arguments**. If you care about the safety and wellbeing of competitors, then don't vote on these arguments. If you don't, then I honestly don't understand why you give up your time to coach and/or judge. The pay can't be that good. I don't believe that you're just in it for the money, which is why I ask you to ask yourselves whether you can justify making debate unsafe for certain people.

## On Case

# Accessible Formatting

#### [1] Independently, Kant is incompatible with a your method – it requires unconditional respect for humanity as an end in itself.

Korsgaard 83 bracketed for gendered language (Christine M., “Two Distinctions in Goodness,” The Philosophical Review Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 169-195, JSTOR)

when a rational being makes a choice [they] supposes its pursuit to be justified there must be something that is unconditionally good It cannot be the inclinations Nor can it be external things the unconditionally valuable thing must be rational nature we must regard ourselves as capable of conferring value upon objects But we must regard others as capable of value rational choices as ends in themselves

#### [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.

. The fact that I cannot satisfy my desires without considering the rightness of my actions suggests that my empirical character must be held in check The Formula of Universal Law enjoins no more than that we act only on maxims that are open to others also . The individual is not allowed to exclude others as moral agents the universalizability is a principle of consistency and of inclusion include the perspective of other moral agents

#### Their use of the term women instead of womxn reinforces hierarchies.

Caira Blignaut, OPINION: Womxn vs Women, March 24, 2018, <https://www.matiemedia.org/opinion-womxn-vs-women/> ///AHS PB

womxn’ comes from the fact that the word need to not be an extension to the word man it indicates that the womxn is fully capable of operating as a single entity without the relief of a man. The word is also intersectional, “as it is meant to include transgender womxn, womxn of color, womxn from third world countries, and every other self-identifying womxn out there this micro- change is vital in terms of representation and discourse

#### The safety of the space is prima facie – we don’t know who’s winning if people can’t engage. Anything that doesn’t immediately denounce atrocities excludes people who have and can experience them.

**Teehan** Ryan Teehan [NSD staffer and competitor from the Delbarton School] – NSD Update comment on the student protests at the TOC in 2014. //Massa

debate is an assumption of safety When we allow arguments that question the wrongness of racism we make debate unsafe for certain people. People who face Effects cannot question those assumptions making debate hostile If you care About people involved in debate then don't vote on these arguments