### 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.** **Isomorphism: 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. Truth testing solves since it’s solely a question of if something is true or false, there isn’t a closest estimate.**

**3. Inclusion- Any offense can function under truth testing whereas your specific role of the ballot excludes all strategies but yours. This is bad for inclusive debates because people without every technical skill or comprehensive debate knowledge are shut out of your scholarship which turns your ROB- truth testing solves because you can do what you’re good at and so can I. This is also better for education because me engaging in a debate I know nothing about doesn’t help anyone.**

### 2

#### interp: debaters must specify if their framework takes out theory or not

#### vio - they don’t “I don’t contend whether theory is coherent but if it is” - we will here - objectivity and truth testing don’t take out theory

#### Standards

#### 1] strat skew - Either I read a theory shell and you just impact turn it in the 1ar, or I don’t read theory and u bust out 4 1ar shells - strat skew ow - having a strategy is key to being able to debate in the firts place and shiftiness prevents us from debating

#### 2] engagement - If theory is bad and you have specified why its bad - only our model of debate allows us to have a legit discussion on whether theory is bad or if its good - you prevent that discussion which shreds critical thinking and theory education.

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### This shell isn’t infinitely regressive because its only asking you to specify one thing and cx doesn’t check because my preround prep was already skewed because I didn’t know how to construct the 1nc. Also judges don’t flow cx so it can't ever be binding.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 bright lines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps. C) judges don’t vote a disad if there is a reasonable amount of offense.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blip storm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

#### And you should evaluate the theory debate after the 2nr – its key to reciprocity since both us get 2 speeches to respond to eachothers arguments

#### Evaluate T before 1AR theory – a) norms – we only have a couple months to set T norms but can set 1AR theory norms anytime, b) magnitude – T affects a larger portion of the debate since the aff advocacy determines every speech after it

#### 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

#### No impact turns to T—T is a procedural that determines case’s validity, and every argument says the aff is bad

### 3

#### Their scholarship is hateful and a reason to lose the round—their author endorsed pedophilia and actively advocated against the age of consent law.

Doezema 18 [Marie Doezema (Parisian Journalist). “France, Where Age of Consent Is Up for Debate.” The Atlantic, 10 March 2018. https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2018/03/frances-existential-crisis-over-sexual-harassment-laws/550700/ //WWDH]

After May 1968, French intellectuals would challenge the state’s authority to protect minors from sexual abuse. In one prominent example, on January 26, 1977, Le Monde, a French newspaper, published a petition signed by the era’s most prominent intellectuals—including Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Gilles Deleuze, Roland Barthes, Philippe Sollers, André Glucksmann and Louis Aragon—in defense of three men on trial for engaging in sexual acts with minors. “French law recognizes in 13- and 14-year-olds a capacity for discernment that it can judge and punish,” the petition stated, “But it rejects such a capacity when the child's emotional and sexual life is concerned.” Furthermore, the signatories argued, children and adolescents have the right to a sexual life: “If a 13-year-old girl has the right to take the pill, what is it for?” It’s unclear what impact, if any, the petition had. The defendants were sentenced to five years in prison, but did not serve their full sentences.

#### Drop the debater—academic spaces have way too many sympathizers who ignore violence against children, and every act must be challenged in the strongest terms because anything else reinforces the epistemic bias in favor of rationalizing disgusting behavior.

Grant 18 [Alec Grant (Independent Scholar, retired from the Uiversity of Brighton where he was a Reader in Narrative Mental Health). “Sanitizing Academics and Damaged Lives” Mad In The UK, 12 April 2018. https://www.madintheuk.com/2018/12/sanitizing-academics-and-damaged-lives/ //WWDH]

Academics who sympathize with paedophilia constitute its intellectual public relations arm. Their role is to make child-adult sex presentable, more acceptable to the public, fit for polite society, sugar-coated, glossed with a scholarly veneer, sanitized. Snapshots of sanitizing academic activity from the last 40 years show how this seeps into and contaminates public policy, education and practice in insidious ways. This is done via the workings of power, privilege, perverse cronyism, and, as Pilgrim (2018) argues, as a result of widespread moral stupor and denial. It’s astonishing that this happens in the face of the psychological and development features of complex post-trauma which are often a consequence of child sexual abuse. By pathologizing adult survivors, often with the ‘Borderline Personality Disorder’ (BPD) tag, mainstream psychiatric business-as-usual plays out its role in suppressing the truth about the consequences of paedophilia among adult survivors. Pilgrim (2018) reminds us that care and mutuality are core ethical features of all sexual practices. As someone who was for many years associated with cognitive therapy, I’m interested in ‘cognitive, or thought distortions’, which are used by people in rationalising their behaviour in self-serving ways. We know from Pilgrim and many other writers, researchers and practitioners about the rationalisations of perpetrators of child sexual abuse and exploitation. They include: Children are not victims but willing participants; They want it; They enjoy it; It’s about friendship; It’s about love; It helps children develop and mature. According to Pilgrim (2018), the ‘heyday’ period of academic versions of such rationalisations was the 1970s. 1977 was the year of an unsuccessful lobby by French intellectuals to defend intergenerational sex. Included among these were the otherwise well-respected philosophers Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Jaques Derrida, Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault. These figures were at the forefront of the use of academic authority to lobby governments to liberalise and decriminalise adult-child sexual contact. In 1978, Foucault took part in a France-Culture broadcast with two other gay theorists, Hocquengham and Danet, to discuss the legal aspects of sex between adults and children. They wanted a repeal of the law preventing this because they took the view that in a liberal (they really meant libertarian) society, sexual preferences generally should not be the business of the law. Foucault, Hocquengham and Danet made the following assertions: that children can, and have the capacity to, consent to such relations without being coerced into doing so; that abuse and post-abuse trauma isn’t real; that the law is part of an oppressive and repressive heteronormative social control discourse which unfairly targets sexual minorities; that children don’t constitute a vulnerable population; that children can and are capable of making the first move in seducing adults (they introduced here the category of ‘the seducing child’); that the laws against sexual relations between children and adults actually function to protect children from their own desires, making them an oppressed and repressed group; that – in the language of the sociologist Stanley Cohen – international public horror about sexual relations between adults and children is a form of moral panic which feeds into constructing the ‘paedophile’ as a folk devil, in turn provoking public vigilantism; that sex between adults and children is actually a trivial matter when compared with ‘real crimes’ such as the murder of old ladies; that many members of the judiciary and other authority figures and groups don’t actually believe paedophilia to be a crime; and that consent should be a private contractual matter between the adult and the child. Fast forward to 1981. The Paedophile Information Exchange (PIE) has been active for seven years. This was a pro-paedophile activist group, founded in the UK in 1974 and officially disbanded in 1984. The group, an international organisation of people who traded in obscene material, campaigned for the abolition of the age of consent. Dr Brian Taylor, the research director and member of PIE, and sociology lecturer at the University of Sussex produced the controversial book Perspectives on Paedophilia, which had the aim of enlightening social workers and youth workers about the benefits of paedophilia. Taylor, who identified as gay, advocated ‘guilt-free pederasty’ (sexual relations between two males, one of whom is a minor). He argued that people generally are hostile to paedophilia only because they don’t understand it, and If they did wouldn’t be so against it. So it was simply a matter of clearing up prejudice and ignorance.

### 4

#### I negate: States ought to ban lethal autonomous weapons.

#### Moral responsibility is the basis of ethics since calling any action good or bad presupposes that there is an agent culpable for bringing it about, and held culpable for that goodness or badness. This principle regulates who is capable of taking ethical actions, for example, we wouldn’t blame a landslide for murder but would blame a person. That negates.

#### First, for an agent to be held responsible, that agent must be acting deliberately with a predefined intention, as otherwise they would not have caused the action.

#### Second, Free actions are only free actions if those actions have one or more logical and antecedent reasons behind them. Otherwise, they would be randomly chosen instead of caused by the agent.

#### Thus the standard is consistency with logical decisionmaking.

#### Third, human actions have no logical or antecedent reasons behind them.

#### A] Crossaply your Hardt evidence. It says that affect is an external force that effects human decisions by intruding into our stable subjectivity. The card literally says people “seldom have significant control over their decision-making”

#### B] Ethics: Human moral evaluations are contaminated by personal affective states, making them arbitrary and unfair.

Scott Jenkins, Professor of Philosophy at University of Kansas, Nietzsche's Transformation of the Problem of Pessimism in Human, All Too Human, The Journal of Nietzsche Studies, Volume 50, Issue 2, Autumn 2019, pp. 272-291 (Article), ///AHS PB

In his summary of Dühring’s introduction to The Value of Life, Nietzsche recognizes the importance of this claim about content and states that for Dühring, “no estimation of value [Werthschätzung] is pure knowledge, all are affections of the mind [Gemüths-Affektionen]” (KSA 8:9[1], p. 135). He continues, “A judgment of the value of life can never be pure knowledge. But I wish to add that it would be more correct to call all such judgments impure knowledge [unreine Erkenntnisse]”—and the rest of a draft of HH 32 follows. For my purposes, two aspects of this impurity are worth emphasizing (in addition to the original claim concerning drive-based content). First, Nietzsche notes that since we are “subject to moods and fluctuations” our drives are themselves in flux (HH 32). And second, our knowledge of the object evaluated in a judgment of value “can never be complete” (HH 32). Thus judgments of value express the relation between our fluctuating conative-affective states and our idiosyncratic representations of a given object. This is why Nietzsche, contra Dühring, regards judgments of value as impure. While they may seem to be as authoritative as theoretical judgments that arguably have some claim to objective (and thus intersubjective) validity, they actually express nothing more than an individual’s shifting practical orientation and idiosyncratic theoretical point of view. From the impurity of evaluative judgments, Nietzsche draws the further conclusion that such judgments are unjust (HH 32). By this he means that in making such judgments, we illegitimately privilege our own drives and affective orientations in relation to others’. He arrives at this conclusion by noting that we cannot refrain from making impure judgments of value: “Perhaps it would follow from all this that one ought not to judge at all; if only it were possible to live without evaluating, without having aversions [Abneigung] and partialities [Zuneigung]!—for all aversion is connected with [hängt zusammen mit] an evaluation, likewise all partiality” (HH 32).16 As living beings, we evaluate entities in accordance with our drives.17 And as human beings, we express such implicit evaluations in judgments of value: “A drive to something or away from something divorced from a feeling one is desiring the beneficial or avoiding the harmful, a drive without some kind of knowing evaluation of the worth of its objective, does not exist in humanity” (HH 32). Nietzsche’s idea here must be that we typically take such judgments to express something about the object itself. We are thus guilty of injustice insofar as we unwittingly take our own subjective orientation to objects, and not those of other actual or possible valuers, to have the authority to determine objects as, say, beneficial or harmful.18 And while we can recognize, on reflection, that judgments of value express only a subjective point of view, we typically think and act as if they do not. Our default state is injustice grounded in what Nietzsche terms our “illogical original relationship [Grundstellung] with all things” (HH 31).

#### Fourth, A robotic architecture that is built using either a theorem prover or neural network (or combination) makes decisions based on logical and objective reasons.

#### Fifth, Therefore, it is *only* androids, not humans, that can act ethically. This means only LAWS can engage in ethical war.

Steven Umbrello, The Future of War: The Ethical Potential of Leaving War to Lethal Autonomous Weapons, 24 January 2019, //BA PB

The conclusion imposes a moral obligation on us, as lawmakers, ethicists, and society in general. Given our knowledge of the war crimes caused by humans throughout history, innate human irrationality in most cases of action, and that LAWs are currently in development, it behooves us, morally speaking, to not only program moral values and ethical reasoning into LAWs, but employ LAWs as the sole actor in combat settings. This, of course, does not discount current technological limitations such as targeting systems that are incapable of distinguishing combatants from noncombatants. Given that this is the case, we must take into account that even a moral agent equipped with such rudimentary targeting systems would not gather the sufficient data to make a valid decision. The above argument is crucially conditional: it states that *if* we can create technologies capable of distinguishing combatants from noncombatants, then we should program moral values into them; and *if* we can program moral values into them, then *only* these technologies should be considered ethical, and thus used as combatants in war.

#### Also the solvency advocate for the counterplan: Use LAWS programmed to act under the affs ethical framework. Puts you in a doublebind where either A) your framework is true so acting under it with LAWS is good and means they aren’t used improperly or B) acting under your framework produces a bad action so your framework is false. Your going to say that the AC necessarily takes out LAWS but you never warrant why nukes are intrinsicially bad, just why misuse makes them a dangerous which the CP solves.

### Case

Cx doenst check these arguments

### Hijack 1

**Affect theory collapses to skep –**

**[1] Absolute fluidity means you can act upon any desire which means you can never condemn a moral action which negates.**

**[2] It is metaphysically impossible for a subject to contain themselves to a good norm if it is a good thing because the subject is always changing, which means no good action can be binding to agents which negates since the aff can’t be enforced.**

**[3] Auto negates since if the external world is always shifting due to affect and its fluid nature, its impossible to have coherent obligations anquered in it.**

### Hijack 2

**The aff collapses to emotivism – a) affect terminates in the normative conclusion of the expression of desire since the aff just makes an ontological claim about the world but that materializes itself in terms of expressions of those desire in every aspect, including linguistic constructs like the resolutional statement b) normative potential of the subject to express their affect which means emotivism is the only way to generate obligations from your framework.**

**That negates –**

**Every emotive judgement is indexed to a particular individual, no emotive sentiments can ever be fully universal. This means that the resolution negates since there is no emotion that can be applied to a universal claim that x is y.**

On Deleuze :

1] Just because you change through time doesn’t mean you are a fundemnatl,ly different person. IE I am still aadit, even if I don’t like soccer anymore, im still the same person.

2] Not normative: just because the subject is fluid doesn’t mean we have an obligation to promote fluitiy

**On Hardt –**

#### 1. This auto negates – lack of external obligation allows individuals to be the sole arbiter of when to follow moral systems in which case the affirmative can’t prove an obligation to do anything because obligation implies a binding aspect where agents must follow rules, else anything is permissible.

**2. Even if passions come from internal meaning, those are only generated or consistent with some external version of humanity which justifies the forms.**

#### 3. Triggers determinism since our actions are caused by emotions outside the subject. That negates since states are made of humans and cant be judged responsible if they take the same action regardless.

On deleuze and Gauttari

1] the aff links, since your philosophy is trying to create the best version of materialism which is always constained by the lack

2] Autonegates, if there is always a lack ethics can never be fulfilled which triggers skep and means we can never have complete obligations.

3] Turns case: Means LAWS are the perfect moral individual since they don’t expierence lack

On active affect:

1] No objective brightline for active vs passive affect

2] Concedes affect can have static properties

On K and R

1] No warrant why norms are bad insofar as we can continue to let them evolve

2] Impact justified, assumes that majoritarianism is bad BUT THIS FRAMEWORK NEVER EXPLAINS WHY

3] Not all norms are bad, IE we operate under the assumption raicms is immoral

On Carlin and Wallin

1] Doublebind: Either A] the judge has no obligation to endorse the winning framework, so they can just hack for the negative or B] The judge has to enforce Deluzian ethics upon the negative so your evidence turns case because it means the aff is violent on a pre fiat level.

2] No link: just asserts that expiremental forms of teaching are good without a warrant, not that truth testing is wrong due to subjectivity.

On Schaefer 13:

1] Just proves there is a world outside of language, but that doesn’t mean our understanding of reality is false

2] Good is good enough—we know a pen is even if there is no direct correlation

3] presuppose sthe world is fluid but we deny that

4] No impact since the NC isn’t normative

On the Offense:

Vote neg:

1] LAWS are a form of decentralized technology which non state actors can use to create new lines of flight.

2] Creating a coherent definition of what a LAW is, is inherently violent because it flattens different pieces of technology into a static norm.

3] LAWS are technology without human control which destabilizes static conceptions of what autonomy and freedom are.

4] The aff is a form of microfacism since they deny subjects ability to make their own choices to develop LAWS which polices difference.

5] In order to say you want to eliminate LAWS, you must say that you want LAWS to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes an moral attempt inherently immoral

6] Turns case, LAWS are a way of subverting current military norms which destabliszes logic

On Robinson

1] Turns case: the aff is passed through the state,

2] Performative reason to drop you since you ask for the ballot which tries to overcode debate into a mechanic activity

On Robinson 2:

1] Flows neg, LAWS are autonomous war machines so the state shutting them down is bad

On Robinsojn 3:

1] Cooption is different then a ban. Ban means they are destroyed everywhere.

2] No warrant what a good vs bad LAW looks like

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)