# 1n

## 1st

#### Interpretation: Affirmative debaters must defend the topic as confined by the resolution

#### Violation – they don’t;

#### No 1ar shift to reclarify their advocacy since it decks negative ground

#### Standards:

#### [1] Predictable limits and ground – allowing the aff to arbitrarily dictate the grounds for the debate makes negative engagement impossible by skirting a predictable starting point and permitting infinite affs, which renders negative research useless and gives them an insurmountable prep advantage.

#### Limits is also key to inclusion because non-topical affirmatives force people to spend their whole lives prepping which means oppressed individuals can’t engage and find your scholarship liberating. Their model also creates a race to the margins where they’re incentivized to pick uncontestable advocacies like “racism is bad.”

#### Aff infinite prep and frontlining means they always have the upper hand on whatever small clash I can generate.

#### Also, TVA solves – they can just read an aff about negative state action and sapping power from the WTO. Alternatively, they can read an aff that says patents are racist and reducing them is helpful.

#### Even if there are disads to the TVA, the benefits outweigh –

#### A] policy-making: cedeing the political lets the alt-right take over and pass more oppressive policies, we need to speak the language of the state

#### B] turn: disads prove there’s neg ground which is the basis for valuable contestation; they aren’t entitled to the perfect aff.

#### Paradigm issues / voters:

#### 1] Fairness is a voter because it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game that requires effective competition to give meaning to the work we do and that benefit can only be actualized through an equal chance to prepare so the judge can decide. Filter impacts through intrinsic-ness – debate doesn’t make us loyal to any content – the only thing that happens is one debater wins and the other loses.

#### Impact turns to fairness are non-sensical and concede its validity – you follow rules created to ensure fair debate like speech times and assume the judge will evaluate your arguments fairly.

#### Drop the debater

#### a] detterence,

#### b] epistemic skew,

#### c] time skew

#### Use competing interps because what is reasonably fair is arbitrary and reasonability encourages debaters to get away with increasingly unfair strategies through defense on theory.

#### And, don’t vote on the RVI on T

#### 1] because it encourages debaters to bait theory

#### 2] illogical – no one should win for being fair

#### 3] develops a chilling affect against checking actual abuse

## 2nd

#### Interpretation: The aff must explicitly specify a comprehensive role of the ballot in the form of a text in the 1AC where they clarify how offense links back to the role of the ballot, such as whether post-fiat offense or pre-fiat offense matters and what constitutes that offense with implications on how to weigh

#### Violation: they don’t

#### Standards:

#### 1. Engagement – Knowing what counts as offense is a prerequisite to making arguments, so its impossible to engage the aff. Our interp ensures that I read something relevant to your method, and knowing how to weigh gives us a standard. Especially true since there is no norm on what "performative engagement" like there is for util offense

#### 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) Turns the aff – your impacts are premised on actually having a debate and engaging with issues of oppression. Almost impossible to engage roles of the ballot are uniquely bad since no one will take seriously a position that can’t be clashed with, so you harm any progress your position can create.

#### c) Strategy Skew – You make formulating a strategy impossible since I don’t know what links to your evaluative mechanism and you can also recontextualize your ROTB to make up reasons why my offense doesn’t link in the 1AR

#### Framing: You can’t use your ROB to exclude my shell. My shell simply constrains how you read your ROTB. My method is your ROTB with specification, so if I’m winning comparative offense, the shell outweighs even if method debates in general preclude theory. If they go for the Aff first that proves the abuse of my shell since they should have specified in the AC.

#### Voters: Fairness

#### /Edu/

#### DTD

#### /CI/

#### No RVI

## 3rd

#### Presumption and permissibility negate, especially if they don’t defend the topic –

#### a~ the aff has to prove an obligation to depart from the squo, if they don’t then we’ve done our job,

#### b~ they get to choose to defend anything they want – if they don’t win then we’ve done the better debating

#### Any moral system faces the problem of regress – I can keep asking “why should I follow this.” Regress collapses to skep since no one can generate obligations absent grounds for accepting them. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” asks for a reason for reasons, which concedes its authority.

#### Reason means we must be able to universally will maxims—our judgements are authoritative and can’t only apply to ourselves anymore than 2+2=4 can be true only for me. and

#### 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, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### We are about post fiat offense, you can weigh with things like perfect and imperfect duty, etc

#### Performativity—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 the aff standard without first willing that we can pursue ends free from 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.

#### 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] Independently not defending the topic is non-universalizable b/c if nobody defended the topic than a topic wouldn’t have even been created in the first place which is a contradiction in conception.

## Case