### 1

#### The role of the ballot is to endorse the debater who proves the truth or falsity of the resolution –

**1. Text – five dictionaries define negate as to deny the truth of**[[1]](#footnote-1)**. Text first – Text comes first – a) Controls the internal link to fairness since it’s the basis of things like predictability and prep b) Key to jurisdiction since the judge can only endorse what is within their burden c) Even if another role of the ballot is better for debate, that is not a reason it ought to be the role of the ballot, just a reason we ought to discuss it.**

#### 2. Inclusion: a) 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. b) Anything can function under truth testing insofar as it proves the resolution either true or false. Specific role of the ballots exclude all offense besides those that follow from their framework which shuts out people without the technical skill or resources to prep for it.

#### 3. Critical pedagogy forces the judge into the role of coercer. Rickert,

(Thomas, “"Hands Up, You're Free": Composition in a Post-Oedipal World”, JacOnline Journal, wbem) **An example of the connection between violence and pedagogy is implicit in** the notion of being "schooled" as it has been conceptualized **by Giroux [is]** and Peter Mcl.aren. They explain, **"Fundamental to** the principles that inform **critical pedagogy is the conviction that schooling for self- and social empowerment** is ethically prior to questions of epistemology or to a mastery oftechnical or social skills that are primarily tied to the logic of the marketplace" (153-54). **A presumption here is that it is the teacher who knows (best)**, and **this** orientation gives the concept of schooling a particular bite: though it presents itself as oppositional to the state and the dominant forms of pedagogy that serve the state and its capitalist interests, it nevertheless **reinscribes an authoritarian model that is congruent with any number of oedipalizing pedagogies that "school" the student in proper behavior.** As Diane Davis notes, radical, feminist, and **liberatory pedagogies** "often **camouflage pedagogical violence in their move from one mode of 'normalization' to another" and "function within a disciplinary matrix of power**, a covert carceral system, **that aims to create useful subjects for particular political agendas" (212).** Such oedipalizing pedagogies are less effective in practice than what the claims for them assert; indeed, the attempt to "school" students in the manner called for by Giroux and McLaren is complicitous with the malaise of postmodern cynicism.Students will dutifully go through their liberatory motions, producing the proper assignments, but it remains an open question whether they carry an oppositional politics with them. The "critical distance" supposedly created with liberatory pedagogy also opens up a cynical distance toward the writing produced in class.

#### 4. Only the exact text of the resolution provides a mutually accessible stasis point for debaters coming into round. Anything else is entirely unpredictable and infinitely regressive since there is no brightline for how much we should care about the

#### resolution.

#### I negate: Normativity is the end goal of ethics since absent being able to guide action, there is no reason to do what is right, and philosophy collapses into skepticism. However agents can always “Why should I do this” to any ethical demand like paying taxes or pursuing pleasure. Only practical reason, or the ability to set and pursue ends, answers the problem of regress since asking “why do I reason” demands a reason for reason, by setting and pursuing the end of asking the question.

#### All ends that we set and pursue must pass the test of universizability.– a) absent universal ethics morality becomes arbitrary and fails to guide action, making ethics useless b) a priori principles like reason apply to everyone since they are independent of human experience and c) 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.

#### It’s impossible to will a violation of freedom since deciding to do would will incompatible ends since it logically entails willing a violation of your own freedom. Constraints are necessary to retain the value of freedom which implies that one cannot hinder the freedom of others. Thus, the countermethod and standard is to embrace a Kantian system of equal and outer freedom.

#### Prefer the standard on a pre-fiat level—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. Thus, it is logically incoherent to justify a standard without first willing that we can pursue ends free from others.

#### Offense –

#### Taking away intellectual property is a contradiction in conception, since if every agent was able to take the intellectual property then a] it would no longer be property and thus would not exist making the initial act incoherent and b] no one would make IP since there’s no incentive to so there’d be no IP to steal. Your critiques of intellectual property link into this.

#### they don’t defend a policy – that’s non topical

#### Resolved indicates policy

Merriam Webster "Definition of RESOLVE," <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resolve> JS

to change by resolution or formal vote

#### Nation refers to political structures.

Collins Dictionary, "Nation definition and meaning," No Publication, <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/nation> JS

A nation is an [individual](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/individual) country [considered](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/consider) together with its [social](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/social) and [political](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/political) structures.

Non topicality is non-universalizable – jurisdictional claim

Also it’s a form of coercion against the opponent

### 2

#### Interpretation, if the aff differs from the conventional truth testing they must explicitly specify a comprehensive standard and clarify how the round will play out under that role of the ballot in the form of a text in the 1AC. To clarify, the aff must:

#### 1. Clarify how offense links back to the role of the ballot, such as whether post-fiat offense or pre-fiat offense matters and which comes first. Truth testing only includes post fiat offense plus theory.

#### 2. Clarify what theoretical objections do and do not link to the aff, such as whether or not the aff comes before theory. Truth Testing doesn’t take out theory.

#### 3. Clarify how to weigh and compare between competing advocacies i.e. whether the role of the ballot is solely determined by the flow or another method of engagement. Only the flow matters under TT.

#### Violation: You don’t specify. Cross apply CX doesn’t check from first shell

#### Standards:

#### ~1~ Engagement – If I don’t know how the role of the ballot functions, its impossible for me to engage the aff, since knowing what counts as offense for me is a prerequisite to being able to make meaningful arguments that clash with yours. Knowing what a legitimate advocacy is ensures that I read something that is relevant to your method, and knowing how to weigh gives us an explicit standard for what is relevant, preventing superficial clash where we each make vacuous preclusion claims. Key 2 fairness because if I couldn’t engage with the aff there is no way I could have won

#### ~2~ Strategy Skew – You make formulating a strategy impossible since I don’t know what links to your evaluative mechanism. My interp means we know what a legitimate neg advocacy is, otherwise you can make up reasons mine doesn’t link to the role of the ballot in the next speech, and by specing a weighing mechanism I can know to make the most relevant arguments so you can’t arbitrarily preclude them in the next speech. K2 education

#### Framing: You can’t use your ROB to exclude my shell. My shell allows you to read your role of the ballot, it just constrains how you can do that. As long as I win comparative offense to my interp it precludes on a methodological level -my method is your ROTB with specification, yours is just the ROTB, so if the former is better it’s a reason to vote for me even if method debates in general preclude theory. Also, if they go for K first that proves the abuse of my shell since they should have specified in the 1ac

#### The impact is fairness—a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game and some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity, b] reversibility – we can get critical education after the round from reading literature, but we can’t reverse a bad decision so fairness outweighs everything else, c] every argument concedes its authority since they presume they’ll actually be evaluated unbiasedly.

#### Use competing interps – topicality is question of models of debate which they should have to proactively justify and we’ll win reasonability links to our offense.

#### They can’t weigh the case—lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume false—they’re also only winning case because we couldn’t engage with it

#### Drop the debater because dropping the arg is severance which moots 7 minutes of 1nc offense

### Case

#### Turns:

#### 1] Good Samaritan – in order to say I want to fic x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes any moral attempt inherently immoral

#### 2] In order to make a moral decision, you must know everything about a particular situation, and you must act immediately in the face on injustice, otherwise you allow injustice to occur. These are simultaneously impossible since a) we cannot know everything about a particular situation and b) there is not infinite time to make an ethical decision. Given that there must be deliberation over any moral decision to ensure its correctness in relation to the situation, the very act of deliberation is violence, as you allow the injustice to continue, but if you were to act immidiately you would act without proper knowledge to correctly address the injustice.

Vote neg on presumption – they don’t do anything cuz debate doesn’t change subjectivities in the real world – cruel optimism

Lack of trigger warning on COVID is violent for Asians

On Sax 20 –

1] Induction fails – and this card is based on it

2] COVID is a determinate thing – it’s a certain group of proteins that form to create a virus

On Kee 15 –

1] We also explain antiblackness – empirical drives and desires created from evolution incentivized things like tribalism, only focus on rationality to critique and reflect on these drives can solve – we critique things like slaveness because that denies rational agency so our method is just as good as them.

2] This card triggers solipsism since critiquing the distinction between self and other means that it’s coherent for the other to be part of the self and for the self to be the only thing that exists

3] We outweigh on bindingness – regress arg means we can’t critique antiblackness absent our framework cuz we can just ask “why be moral”

On Chandrashekhar –

1] This card is terrible – it just gives some examples of people getting vanished due to COVID and a disease from 200 years ago, but this can’t prove some kind of structural claim about medicines.

2] Empirically disproven – people read whole-rez affs all the time and have resolvable debates

3] Securitization against COVID good

On ROJ

1] This is impact justified – just because confronting abjection is good doesn’t mean it should be the sole focus of the round, there could be other good things in debate

2] Binaries are good – we can obviously say things like 1+1=2 is true and that 1+1=3 is false which proves that betraying binaries is illogical.

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)