==1==

====Interpretation: Reading offense under more than 1 framework in the 1AC is a voting issue.====

====Violation: The AFF read offense under Rawls and Util.====

====Voting issue 2 warrants - ====

====1~~] Philosophical ground – Means you won't clash on the philosophical layer and just go for whatever offense is less touched. That decks both topic education and phil discussions which are the key reason behind LD. ====

====2~~] NEG ground – I need to find CP's/Das/and K's that solves offense under both Rawls and Util which is impossible because they are conflicting viewpoints. That decks fairness and skews the round in favor of the aff. ====

====Drop the debater – that sets better norms for debate.====

====Competing interps – creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.====

====No RVIs – a~~] Illogical, you don't win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it's a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument====

==2==

====The intertwined regimes of power that construct society define themselves in opposition to the queer Other that directly threatens the "good" National population. Binaries that paint the Other as the virus infiltrating the healthy population that must be located and "cured" mark queer bodies for violence and death. The affirmatives use and resuscitation of state power depends on constant elimination of the existence of the Other through explicit forms of violence and a deliberate denial of the life chances that structure the experience of everyday life, annihilating the body from all sides through exposure to slow death.====

\*\*Spade \*\*20\*\*11 -\*\* Dean Spade is a lawyer, writer, trans activist, and Associate Professor of Law at Seattle University School of Law. In 2002, he founded the Sylvia Rivera Law Project, a non-profit law collective in New York City that provides free legal services to transgender, intersex and gender non-conforming people who are low-income and/or people of color ("Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law," South End Press) hrmb.

This way of understanding the dispersion of power helps us realize that Power is not

AND

that attest to be race-  and gender- neutral and merely administrative.

====Thus, we negate AND endorse the queer suicide terrorist—an explosion of self-sacrifice that ruptures the violent notions of subjectivity. The queer suicide terrorist is antithetical to Western Politics, as we blow up reason and power. The explosive strapped to our bodies cannot be separated from our biological form; our body is an undefinable weapon, a lethal concoction of the organic and inorganic. As we approach you, you are dead, but you think you are still alive. There is nothing good you have done, or anything bad which makes me want to kill you—I only know you as the molecules that I am going to re-arrange. Where does life begin and end? This question is only answerable from a position of reason and power that we want to blow up.====

\*\*Puar 07 \*\*(Jasbir, associate professor in the Department of Women's and Gender Studies at Rutgers University, "Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times," Duke University Press, 2007, p. 216-220)//2simmz

The fact that we approach suicide bombing with such trepidation, in contrast to how

AND

ballistic body. Contagion, infection, and transmission reign, not meaning.

====Queer performances of assemblage scare the state – this works to shift the epistemology of queer subjectivity – we have to accept the terrorist and stop trying to assimilate====

\*\*Puar 5\*\* Jasbir Puar, 2007, "Queer Times, Queer Assemblages," Rutgers University, http://jasbirkpuar.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Queer-Times-Queer-Assemblages-1.pdf //SW

José Esteban Muñoz's writing on the "terrorist drag" of the Los Angeles–

AND

allows for both the temporality of being and the temporality of always becoming.

==3==

====Interpretation: The AFF must disclose 30 minutes before the round.====

====Violation: They didn't. Screenshots are below – ====

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

====The decision not to disclose was not ablenormatively neutral — rather it reified neuronormative privilege. Neurodivergent folks would prefer the ability to plan in advance for social situations and interactions. Griswold '16: ====

(Ann Griswold, Ann has a Ph.D. in biomedical sciences from the University of Florida and an M.S. in science journalism from the Johns Hopkins University.April 8, 2016, Uncertainty drives anxiety, sensory issues in autism ~| Spectrum ~| Autism Research News, https://www.spectrumnews.org/news/uncertainty-drives-anxiety-sensory-issues-in-autism/, September 10, 2021)

The findings support the theory thatChildren with autism perceive the world as overwhelming because they

AND

The work appeared 10 February in the Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders.

====Voting issue:====

====The 1AC is both an inaccessible and unsafe speech act for neuroqueer debaters — this is a form that both precedes and turns the AFF. Reject the aff to deter ableist norms. Griswold '16: ====

(Ann Griswold, Ann has a Ph.D. in biomedical sciences from the University of Florida and an M.S. in science journalism from the Johns Hopkins University.April 8, 2016, Uncertainty drives anxiety, sensory issues in autism ~| Spectrum ~| Autism Research News, https://www.spectrumnews.org/news/uncertainty-drives-anxiety-sensory-issues-in-autism/, September 10, 2021,)

Up to 84 percent of children with autism have high levels of anxiety, and

AND

on the spectrum, it may be more effective to enhance its predictability."

====Discourse in round comes first – if you endorse the AFF, endorse all of it. If I win that they have been violent that means u should divorce yourself from the flow. Vincent No Date: ====

(Christopher Vincent, Debate Coach, former college NDT debater~~] "Re-Conceptualizing Our Performances: Accountability In Lincoln Douglas Debate)

Charles Mills argues that "the moral concerns of African Americans have centered on the

AND

color, and in turn destroy the transformative potential this community could have.

====They can have new AFFs but they just have to give the details so that disabled debaters can access it and have time for preparation. ====

====They say I must disclose – ====

====They literally trigger their own violation. ====

==4==

====The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best proves the truth or falsity of the resolution.====

====~~[1~~] Text: Multiple dictionaries define negate "as to deny the truth of" and affirm as "to prove true" which means the sole obligation of the judge is to vote on the resolution's truth or falsity. Any other role of the ballot enforces an external norm on debate and only truth-testing is intrinsic to the process of debate. ====

====~~[2~~] Philosophical education: Other paradigms exclude relevant philosophies. For example, philosophies such as deontology and contractarianism are not directly comparative. Deontology cannot be comparative since it's based on absolute maxims. ====

====Permissibility and presumption negate. ====

====~~[1~~] The resolution indicates the AFF has to prove a proactive obligation and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation.====

====~~[2~~] Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about. ====

====~~[3~~] Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. ====

====The AFF has a necessary but insufficient burden to prove that objectivity exists. If objectivity does not exist, vote negative. The statement that "unicorns are beautiful animals" is nonsensical if unicorns do not exist. Similarly, objectivity cannot be valued over advocacy if objectivity does not exist. If the resolution implies the existence of a concept that does not exist, the resolution would be nonsensical – and should be negated.====

====Therefore, the resolution cannot be true if it's nonsensical as coherence is a side-constraint to truth. ====

====Objectivity does not exist because -====

====1~~] All worldviews are rooted in assumptions. Wijnberg '17:====

(Rob Wijnberg, "Why Objective Journalism is a Misleading and Dangerous Illusion", 10/7/17, https://thecorrespondent.com/6138/why-objective-journalism-is-a-misleading-and-dangerous-illusion/157316940-eb6c348e)

There's no such thing as objectivity: Marcel Gelauff says he doesn't want his editorial

AND

. And it's also the worst instruction you can give your editorial team.

====2~~] The brain's filtering process means objectivity is impossible. Taflinger '96:                      (Richard Taflinger, "The Myth of Objectivity in Journalism: A Commentary", 5/29/96, https://public.wsu.edu/~~taflinge/mythobj.html)====

Preconceptions, prejudices, biases, cultural norms and mores, education, superstition, peer opinion, all play their role in an people creating their own realities. This process I call~~[is~~] filtering. No matter what the senses perceive, The mind has to understand the information in terms that it can believe. This information filters through the person's experience, education, culture and upbringing. These in turn can affect the person's sense of politics, morality, religion, race, sex, economics, and even humor. These filters are preconceptions, biases, prejudices and attitudes that influence the way the mind processes information and therefore how the individual constructs his or her world and reality. For example, several witnesses see a traffic accident no one could survive. Nonetheless, nobody is hurt. All the witnesses see, objectively, the same event. Yet, what they "see" differs according to how they filter the information: a devoutly religious person will see the hand of God in sparing the victims; a politician may see a necessity for government action to make that intersection safer; an attorney may see a potential lawsuit; a sexist may blame a driver of the opposite sex. It is a problem well known to law enforcement and the legal profession: eye witnesses can't seem to agree on what they saw. It is not the fault of the witness. It is simply that what is perceived must be understood, and understanding usually comes through relating new information to old. Whatever the old information is influences how the new is understood. For another example, take the case of several young black men walking down a street. What are they: a peace gathering, a civil rights march, a street gang, a protest parade, the local black student union? Or are they simply several young black men who, by pure chance, happen to be walking in the same direction at a pace sufficient to bring them close together? Any of the above answers could be correct. They could also all be wrong. Until one asks each man what he is doing, preconception will create the reality of the observer. Of course, even the post-questioning reality can be wrong if one or more of the men lie.Because the world is a subjective construct unique to each person, it isn't possible for there to be an objective discussion of the world or the events that take place in it. What is possible is for people to describe the world they have created on the basis of what they have perceived.

==Case==

====On the FW – ====

====1~~] Pragmatism fails as a philosophical theory because of its ambiguous nature. The Encyclopedia of Philosophy explains:====

(Encyclopedia of Philosophy, "Pragmatism", 2006, Thomson Gale, http://www.encyclopedia.com/humanities/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/pragmatism)

There is, however, a more serious and persistent problem of interpretation entrenched in

AND

(1878), pragmatists continued to have so much trouble in doing so.

====2~~] Pragmatism collapses to util because of how it looks through a lens of consequences.====

====On their Offense - ====

====1~~] Arbitrarily including contrarian opinion for the sake of balance causes climate change denialism====

Brüggemann and Engesser 17 ~~[Michael Brüggemann, educator at the University of Hamburg, and Sven Engesser, educator at the Technical University of Dresden, 2017, "Beyond false balance: How interpretive journalism shapes media coverage of climate change," Research Gate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312015168\_Beyond\_false\_balance\_How\_interpretive\_journalism\_shapes\_media\_coverage\_of\_climate\_change~~]/Kankee

22 1. Introduction 23 While scientific consensus on anthropogenic climate change has been growing

AND

data with survey data (following the model introduced in Dearing (1995)).

====2~~] A disproportionate contrarian presence in news compared to the scientific consensus on climate change prevents further climate action====

Petersen et al. 19 ~~[Alexander Michael Petersen, Associate Professor at UC Merced, Emmanuel M. Vincent, Research Scientist with a PhD at the University Pierre et Marie Curie and a post-doctoral fellowship at MIT, and Anthony LeRoy Westerling, professor at UC Merced with a PhD from UC San Diego, 2019, "Discrepancy in scientific authority and media visibility of climate change scientists and contrarians," Nature Communications, https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-019-09959-4~~]/Kankee

We juxtapose 386 prominent contrarians with 386 expert scientists by tracking their digital footprints across

AND

, which all together hinders prospects for rapid public action on CC41. Results

====3~~] Conservatives will use false balance and perceived liberal bias to spew climate change denialism under the guise of objectivity====

Hoewe et al. 21 ~~[Jennifer Hoewe, Assistant Professor, Brian Lamb School of Communication, Purdue University Kathryn Cramer Brownell, Associate Professor, Department of History, Purdue University, and Eric C. Wiemer, Doctoral Candidate, Brian Lamb School of Communication, Purdue University, 02-2021, "The Role and Impact of Fox News," De Gruyter, https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/for-2020-2014/html~~]/Kankee

One of the areas clearly related to Fox News consumption is migration-related policy

AND

reducing the spread of the virus, including wearing masks and social distancing.

====4~~] No impact—climate change is alarmism. Curry '17:====

(Judith Curry, President of Climate Forecast Applications Network (CFAN), previously Professor and Chair of the School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences at the Georgia Institute of Technology, 1/29/17, "The 'threat' of climate change," https://judithcurry.com/2017/01/29/the-threat-of-climate-change/)

I think that use of these words mislead the public debate on climate change —

AND

change is not an existential threat on the timescale of the 21st century.

====5~~] No impact to climate change – empirics, adaptation, and their science is flawed. Shani '15:====

(Amir Shani – PhD @ the University of Central Florida, researches ecotourism and ethics at the University of the Negev, Eilat Campus. Boaz Arad – spokesman in the Public Policy Center at the Jerusalem Institute for Market Studies, "There is always time for rational skepticism: Reply to Hall et al," April 2015, ScienceDirect)

The uncertainty that encompasses current climate change assessments is strengthened in light of the studies

AND

====6) Democratic peace theory is backwards. Baliga '11:====

(Baliga 11—prof of managerial economics and decision sciences at Kellog School of Business, NU. PhD from Harvard—AND—Tomas Sjöström—chaired prof of economics at Rutgers—AND—David O. Lucca—economist with the Federal Reserve Board (Sandeep, Domestic Political Survival and International Conflict: Is Democracy Good for Peace?, The Review of Economic Studies, July 2011, 78;3)

The idea that democracy promotes peace has a long history. Thomas Paine argued that

AND

, with hostile neighbours, do not enjoy a low level of conflict.

===Underveiw===

====RVIs on 1AR theory – A) 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2NR to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew. B) The 1AR can restart by spamming 7 1AR shells uplayering the entire 1NC. RVIs are key to check this back. ====

====Reject 1AR theory-====

====A~~] 7-6 time skew means it's endlessly AFF biased. ====

====B~~] I don't have a 3NR which allows for endless extrapolation. ====

====C~~] 1AR theory is skewed to the AFF because they have a 2AR and judge psychology warrant which is also a reason why they shouldn't get 2AR weighing. ====

====D~~] Method testing – Too many theory flows make it impossible to test the AFF method. 1AR theory uniquely adds too much.====

====E~~] Resolvability – 1. Reciprocity, you get a 2-1 speech advantage. 2. Norming – we only get 2 speeches of new arguments to deliberate over your shell which isn't enough time and would create worse norms. ====

====F~~] 1AR theory used as a strategic advantage means infinite abuse claims should be viewed with a grain of salt====