## 1

#### A: Interpretation – Debaters must only read normatively justified frameworks.

#### B: Violation – there’s no starting point and justification of why we should care about the impacts you reference, like the “exploitation of the soul” or preservation of the world are and why things like empathy and love are good EVEN IF THEY ARE –

#### 

#### C: Standards –

#### 1. Strat skew – Reading an impact justified framework destroys my strategy: A) Turn ground – it artificially exclude impacts from a larger framework that would justify your impact being bad which means you can cherry pick any impact that flows one direction B) Limits – it makes it impossible for me to answer your framework because you can choose any impact that is always bad like racism which leaves me no ground and grants you an infinite number of impacts to defend that aren’t justified by a broader philosophy. Also, you should reject impact justified frameworks because they fail and derive a moral imperative to act.

#### 2. Phil ed – Impact justified framework destroy phil ed: A) Justification – impact justification destroys the requirement to learn concepts like normativity, metaphysics, meta-ethics, and other types of justifications for frameworks since all you need is reasons why one impact is bad

#### Voters –

#### Fairness comes before the AC – A] Inescapable – every argument you make concedes the authority of fairness: i.e. that the judge will evaluate your arguments fairly so if they say fairness doesn’t matter you can just vote neg because that’s unfair so who cards B] Skews ability to evaluate substance – if one debater had ten minutes to speak and the other had three there would be incongruence that alters ability to judge the winner

#### Education is a voter – a) schools fund debate and b) it’s the only portable skill from debate

#### DD – a) to deter future abuse, b) otherwise they could just kick and go for the positive time tradeoff on theory, c) the round has been skewed so theory is the only fair place to vote, and

#### CI – a) reasonability requires judge intervention because I don’t know where your BS meter is, and b) reasonability creates a race to the bottom since it motivates debaters to use increasingly unfair strategies and get away with them by playing defense on theory.

#### No RVIs – a) It’s illogical to vote for you for being fair, rounds without theory would be irresolvable b) It incentivizes you to bait theory and win off a scripted CI.

#### The theory debate should be evaluated when the 2NR ends, not the 2AR: [1] I have no 3NR, so evaluating the theory debate after the 2AR puts me at a structural disadvantage since I can’t point out 2AR argument shifts or extrapolations and to respond to new 2AR arguments. [2] Time skew: the aff has 7 minutes of speech time between the 3 minute 2AR and 4 minute 1AR, while I only have a 6 minute 2NR.

**No impact turns: 1] Theory is just an argument for why the aff is a bad idea, which is what every single negative position says—there’s nothing unique about theory that causes violence but the cap k or case turns don’t 2] we’re not imposing a norm or forcing you to do anything—our norm is open to contestation because you can just win that a counter-interpretation is a better norm 3] No impact turns on this shell uniquely because I want to engage and have a substantive discussion about the affirmative but I can’t because of the practice you’ve engaged in.**

## 2

#### Interp: Debaters must disclose round reports on the 2021-2022 NDCA LD wiki for every round they have debated this season. Round reports disclose which positions (AC, NC, K, T, Theory, etc.) were read/gone for in every speech.

#### Violation: screenshot in the doc – they said they would send the doc over slack and didn’t make a wiki

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

#### \

#### 1] Level Playing Field – big schools can go around and scout and collect flows but independents are left in the dark so round reports are key for them to prep- they give you an idea of overall what layers debaters like going for so you can best prepare your strategy when you hit them. Accessibility first and independent voter – it's an impact multiplier.

#### 2] Pre-round prep –1ARs gives especially give an idea of what type of debater someone is – they could go for 1AR theory every round– otherwise I enter every round unknowing whereas you have an idea of what you want to go for from the start.

#### 3] Asking more preround doesn’t solve:

#### 1] other people who don't debate you can see your args and learn which is a better model of debate

#### 2] there is a benefit to not asking all the time because I have more time to prep and people are shady

#### 3] Unverifiable: we don’t know you would have even if i asked and they also have no reason under ci why asking is net good so dont let them do that in the 2ar

Xapply voters

## 3

#### Permissibility and presumption negate – a. if the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation b. Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false. C. we don’t presume everything true, that’s why we don’t believe in conspiracy theories

#### The neg burden is to prove that the aff won’t logically happen in the status quo, and the aff burden is to prove that it will.

#### Prefer:

#### 1] Text –

#### A] Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### B] Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought> //Massa

#### 2] Debatability – A] it focuses debates on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years – Resolvability is an independent voter cuz otherwise the judge can’t make a decision which means it’s a constraint on any burden because otherwise the round is impossible B] moral framework debate is impossible.

Joyce 02 Joyce, Richard. Myth of Morality. Port Chester, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2002. p 45-47.

This distinction between what is accepted from within an institution, and “stepping out” of that institution and appraising it from an exterior perspective, is close to Carnap’s distinction between internal and external questions. 15 Certain **“linguistic frameworks”** (as Carnap calls them) **bring** with them **new** terms and **ways of talking: accepting the language of “things” licenses making assertions** like “The shirt is in the cupboard”; **accepting mathematics allows one to say “There is a prime number greater than one hundred”;** accepting the language of propositions permits saying “Chicago is large is a true proposition,” etc. Internal to the framework in question, confirming or disconfirming the truth of these propositions is a trivial matter. But traditionally **philosophers have interest**ed themselves **in** the external question – **the issue of the adequacy of the framework itself:** “Do objects exist?”, “Does the world exist?”, “**Are there numbers?”,** “Are the propositions?”, etc. Carnap’s argument is that **the** external **question,** as it has been typically construed, **does not make sense. From a perspective that accepts mathematics, the answer to the question “Do numbers exist?” is just** trivially **“Yes.”** From a perspective which has not accepted mathematics, Carnap thinks, the only sensible way of construing the question is not as a theoretical question, but as a practical one: “Shall I accept the framework of mathematics?”, and this pragmatic question is to be answered by consideration of the efficiency, the fruitfulness, the usefulness,etc., of the adoption. But the (traditional) **philosopher’s questions** – “But is mathematics true?”, “Are there really numbers?” – **are pseudo-questions.** By turning traditional philosophical questions into practical questions of the form “Shall I adopt...?”, Carnap is offering a noncognitive analysis of metaphysics. Since I am claiming that we can critically inspect morality from an external perspective – that we can ask whether there are any non-institutional reasons accompanying moral injunctions – and that such questioning would not amount to a “Shall we adopt...?” query, Carnap’s position represents a threat. What arguments does Carnap offer to his conclusion? He starts with the example of the “thing language,” which involves reference to objects that exist in time and space. **To** step out of the thing language and **ask “But does the world exist?” is a mistake,** Carnap thinks, **because the very notion of “existence” is a term which belongs to the thing language, and can be understood only within that framework, “hence this concept cannot be meaningfully applied to the system itself.”** 16 Moving on to the external question “Do numbers exist?” Carnap cannot use the same argument – he cannot say that “existence” is internal to the number language and thus cannot be applied to the system as a whole. Instead he says that philosophers who ask the question do not mean material existence, but have no clear understanding of what other kind of existence might be involved, thus such questions have no cognitive content. It appears that this is the form of argument which he is willing to generalize to all further cases: **persons who dispute** whether propositions exist, **whether properties exist,** etc., do not know what they are arguing over, thus they **are not arguing over the truth of a proposition,** but over the practical value of their respective positions. Carnap adds that this is so because there is nothing that both parties would possibly count as evidence that would sway the debate one way or the other.

#### 3] Neg definition choice – the aff should have defined ought in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable contestation, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

#### Now negate:

#### 1] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t going to happen since there are structural barriers that preclude. Also you don’t get to say in the 1ar that the aff is non inherent because you took a stance in the aff that it was which is an academic integrity issue.