## 1.

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement –

#### A~ anything else moots 7 minutes of the NC – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that their theory of power is better than another before you adopt it.

#### B~ The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true so it's constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

#### C~ it’s the most logical since you don’t say vote for the player who shoots the most 3 points, the better player wins since debate is a game with rules given by how there’s a winner and loser. Answers collapse to truth testing since they require truth value i.e. truth testing is false requires proving that it is true that truth testing is false.

#### D~ Nothing leaves this round other than the result on the ballot which means even if there is a higher purpose, it doesn’t change anything, and you should just write whatever is important on the ballot and vote for me.

#### E~ ROBs that aren’t phrased as binaries maximize leeway for interpretation as to who is winning offense. Scalar framing mechanisms necessitate that the judge has to intervene to see who is closest at solving a problem.

#### F~ Other ROBs open the door for personal lives of debaters to factor into decisions and compare who is more oppressed which causes violence in a space where some people go to escape

#### G~ They don’t prove the rez true so you should negate on face.

#### Negate

#### 1) Darwinian dilemma—if moral facts were objective realities, species who believed them would’ve died out since they’re dominated by beliefs that are more evolutionarily advantageous. Since we believe there are moral facts, they’re merely beliefs that help us reproduce with no independent normative force

#### 2) Bonini’s Paradox- As a model of a complex system becomes more complete, it becomes less understandable; for it to be more understandable it must be less complete and therefore less accurate. Therefore no philosophical or political model can be useful.

#### 3) Linguistics – words are indeterminate since every claim requires a empirical verification, which is impossible given the arbitrariness of meaning. If I say, “The man is on the table”, that statement is true if and only if a certain man is on a certain table. This takes out any definition based a prioris because they can’t be based on a definition.

## 2.

#### Interpretation: The aff must explicitly specify a comprehensive advocacy text in the 1AC where they clarify how their offense links back to the role of the ballot, is it post-fiat offense or pre-fiat offense and a clear explanation of the advocacy’s actor, action and object

#### Violation: We don’t know why the actor matters under their framework, why the advocacy is linked to their research practices, and what the object of the aff is actually eliminating.

CX is too short – even if they could answer it, we shouldn’t be forced to use prep time

#### Standards:

#### 1. Engagement – Knowing their advocacy is a prerequisite to making meaningful arguments, so its impossible to engage the aff. Our interp ensures that I read something relevant to your method, and knowing pre-fiat or post-fiat offense gives us a standard for what is relevant. This is true of kritikal affs since there is no norm on what “symbolic terrorism” is in the same way there is for what counts as a plan. Few impacts:

#### a) Education – When two ships pass in the night we don’t learn anything - This also guts novice inclusion because now they can never learn arguments in round.

#### b) Link turns the aff – Your impacts are premised on engaging with issues of oppression, but no one will take seriously a position that can’t be clashed with

#### c) Strategy Skew – You can recontextualize your advocacy to make up reasons why my links and offense don’t link in the 1AR

#### Framing: You can’t use the aff to exclude my shell. My shell simply constrains how you read your advocacy. My method is your advocacy with specification, so if I’m winning comparative offense, the shell outweighs even if method debates in general preclude theory.

#### No impact turns or RVIs – A] Substance – if theory’s bad then we should try debating on substance – impact turns force me to go for T since I need to defend my position. B] Dead end – strategy guides debates so they’ll desire that people read theory to beat them on the impact turn – that proves their strategy is reactive and can’t solve since they rely on the structures they critique.

#### Drop the Debater – 1AR restarts force late-developing debates that favor the aff since they get a 7-6 time skew and ensure surface-level clash.

#### Competing interp – offense defense paradigm is the best method for evaluation since you can compare benefits under both interps easier.

## 3.

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

#### 1] Regress: A theory is only binding when you can answer the question “why should I do this?” and not continue to ask “why”. Only practical reason provides a deductive foundation for ethics since the question “why should I be rational” already concedes the authoritative power of agency since your agency is at work. Metaethical standards outweigh: they determine what counts as a warrant for a standard, so absent grounding in some metaethical framework, their arguments aren’t relevant normative considerations.

#### 2] Action theory: only evaluating action through reason solves since reason is key to evaluate intent, otherwise we could infinitely divide actions. For example: If I was brewing tea, I could break up that one big action into multiple small actions. Only our intention, to brew tea unifies these actions if we were never able to unify action, we could never classify certain actions as moral or immoral since those actions would be infinitely divisible.

#### And, reason must be universal – [A] a reason for one agent is a reason for another agent. I can’t say 2+2=4 is true for me but not for you – that’s incoherent.

#### [B] any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends i.e. if I want to eat ice cream, I must recognize that others may affect my pursuit of that end and demand the value of my end be recognized by others.

#### Thus, counter-methodology: Vote negative to engage in a liberation strategy of universal reason. This entails a starting point where we abstract from individual perspectives to understand the universal, and use this starting point to apply it to empirical institutions and agents. No perms: Uniquely non-sensical in a method debate: a] It assumes a notion of fiat that doesn’t make sense without a plan. The 1AC role of the ballot forefronts the performative and methodological which a permutation steals away b] non-T affs shouldn’t get perms since they can defend literally anything in the world – thus the burden is on them to prove their advocacy is the best solution to the problem they propose.

#### 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] 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.**

#### [2] The aff has a deontological obligation to be topical – it was agreed upon and it’s jurisdictionally determined on tabroom and NSDA.

**Nebel 15** Jake Nebel,"The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel," Briefly, <https://www.vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/>

A second strategy denies that such pragmatic benefits are relevant. This strategy is more deontological. One version of this strategy appeals to the importance of consent or agreement. Suppose that you give your opponents prior notice that you’ll be affirming the September/October 2012 resolution instead of the current one. There is a sense in which your affirmation of that resolution is now predictable: your opponents know, or are in a position to know, what you will be defending. And suppose that the older resolution is conducive to better (i.e., more fair and more educational) debate. Still, it’s unfair of you to expect your opponents to follow suit. Why? Because they didn’t agree to debate that topic. They registered for a tournament whose invitation specified the current resolution, not the Sept/Oct 2012 resolution or a free-for-all. The “social contract” argument for topicality holds that accepting a tournament invitation constitutes implicit consent to debate the specified topic. This claim might be contested, depending on what constitutes implicit consent. What is less contestable is this: given that *some* proposition must be debated in each round and that the tournament has specified a resolution, no one can reasonably reject a principle that requires everyone to debate the announced resolution as worded. This appeals to Scanlon’s contractualism. Someone who wishes to debate only the announced resolution has a strong claim against changing the topic, and no one has a stronger claim against debating the announced resolution (ignoring, for now, some possible exceptions to be discussed in the next subsection). So it is unfair to expect your opponent to debate anything other than the announced resolution. This unfairness is a constraint on the pursuit of education or other goods: it wrongs and is unjustifiable to your opponent.

#### 3] Prefer Ideal theory to Non-Ideal theory- A] Sequencing- We need an ideal world to envision in order for us to work and move towards so only ideal theory can guide action B] Relativity Problem- We can’t assign universal obligation since non-ideal theory commits us to understanding individual circumstances which is radically different for each person. That allows for ethical exceptions which makes their theory non-binding. C] Is-ought gap- we cannot create prescriptive statements based of non-ideal descriptive claims of the world i.e. saying the sky is blue does not translate to the sky ought to be blue

## 4.

#### Our Interpretation is that the affirmative must proactively justify a framework for the evaluation of the round that defines the ethical system through which we evaluate what is good. To clarify, they must normatively justify their aff.

#### Violation – there is no ethical theory that defines the good in the 1ac.

#### Vote neg for pedagogical pluralism – Not normatively justifying a framework presupposes certain philosophical backing which either invites judge intervention creating pedagogical imperialism and essentializes solutions to oppression bracketing off avenues for combatting it – turns case

**De La O 17[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**It is absurd to believe that we should bracket off certain questions for a normative framework because “we know what the problem is and we should fight against it” as if the intuitions of these bourgeoisie kids have the answers to the questions over the good that people have been battling over for thousands of years.** **Such approaches ignore the historically changing definition of oppression and fall back to a stereotypical model of activism that will only reify and order and render certain peoples experience as insufficient**. These approaches also discredit the hundreds of critical theorists who have battled over the limits of structural violence, identity politics, and activism and the ongoing debate in the literature. The call for framework debate does not envision a particular form of debate. What the judge should permit is answered by the winning framework. Rigorous justification does not prevent a focus on deconstructing systems of oppression but is what makes the account meaningful across difference in experience. **Anything else assumes a model of debate as intuitively superior and stigmatizes the experience of others or gives the judge too much power to arbitrarily determine the good for debate.** **The judge should not advance their own model of activism, thereby reifying a subjective order of what debate should be and establishing a disproportionate power relationship between the judge and the student, and instead should evaluate what ought to be permitted in debate through the winning framework**. To clarify, this does not prevent the judge from intervening when the debate ceases to be a competition between ideas. In this case, intervention does not reify a disproportionate power relationship between the judge and the student but only functions to resist a disproportionate power relationship between one debater and another. Again, when and how judges should intervene is a discussion saved for later, but examples such as physical violence clearly help us see the scope of our obligations as judges who evaluate competitive arguments versus judges who protect students from direct violence.

#### 2] Resolvability – no evaluative mechanism means that the judge doesn’t know which impacts matter than others.

#### They cannot weigh the aff against the shell since it includes all of your claims, just adds the plank of ethics.

## 5.

#### Text – We advocate for the entirety of the 1AC except for their advocacies telos of eliminating IPRs.

#### That solves the Aff – Hui is not about interventions because the cybernetic system “It assimilates contingencies “but embracing the orientation of the inhuman by rejecting “transhumanist ideology” solves

#### 3 Net Benefits –

#### 1] Cultural Capitalism – Reduction of Cybernetic Resistance to a simple one-line statement results in a fancy hash-tag or t-shirt statement which footnotes and commodifies movements into Capitalism – only by engaging the hard grassroots of resistance that is unspoken but ever-present can solve.

#### 2] Deradicalization – Using contingent resistant strategies ends the movement once the goal is met – this de-radicalizes survival by tying it to particular points which results in cruel hope and optimism by thinking that cybernetic thought will be gone with a single plan.

#### 3] Transparency – Tiqqun says movements must be “unpredictable in the eyes of the imperial system” by using “techniques of secrecy” – their affirmative’s call to order around a singular plan recreates the “with us or against us” rhetoric of the war on terror where you’re either for or against IPwhich re-inscribes sides leading to the re-creation of targeted otherness – assemblage praxis “cannot be as clear”

## 6.

#### Vote on fairness –

#### a] testing – you can’t evaluate their args because the round was skewed – if they have 10 minutes to win their aff or fairness bad and I have 1 for the opposite they will win

#### b] they concede its authority via speech times and tournament procedure

#### c] hacking – if they say it’s irrelevant then you can be unfair against them and vote for me

#### d] the ballot can never alter subjectivities but it can rectify unfairness

#### e] jurisdiction – the ballot says to vote for the better debater not the better cheater – that’s a metaconstraint,

#### f] inclusion – nobody plays an unfair game – that’s lexically prior to their reading of the aff in debate

#### Presumption and permissibility negates –

#### a) more often false than true since I can prove something false in I nfinite ways

#### b) the aff has to prove an obligation which means lack of that obligation negates

#### c) to negate[[4]](#footnote-4) means to deny the truth of which means if the aff is false you vote neg

#### d) permissibility can’t affirm since then anything would be ok which would justify racism – we should be safe and do nothing.

#### Err negative on framing even if we don’t win DTD

#### 1] We don’t know the implications of their arguments or how to weigh impacts which means that you should default to neg framing – our 1nc strat was premised on a 1AC that didn’t read any framing and a 1ar restart moots 7 minutes of the 1NC and incentivizes intentionally vague scholarship in favor of 1ar sandbagging and devastating 2ar collapses.

## Case

#### Viritual presumption:

#### 1] Systems- the 1AC says institutions create social realities that replicate violence but in-round discourse does nothing to alter conditions. All you do is encourage teams to write better framework blocks.

#### 2] Spillover- they are missing an internal link as to why they need the ballot or why the reading of the aff forwards change. Empirically denied – judges vote on shoes theory all the time and nothing happens.

#### 3] Competition- debate is the wrong forum for change and competition moots any ethical value of the aff. Winning rounds just makes it seem like you want to win and a loss is internalized as a technical mistake.

reality already happened.

#### Vote neg on

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. La O, Dino De. “A CALL FOR FRAMEWORK DEBATE.” *NSD Update*, 26 Oct. 2017, nsdupdate.com/2017/a-call-for-framework-debate-by-dino-de-la-o/. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
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