# Theory

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives may not over-specify the plan of the 1AC. To clarify, you may spec 1) Governments 2) Subset of rights or 3) Subset of who gets the right to strike Violation: They spec governments and who gets the right to strike

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Limits - Their model of debate explodes the prep burden because I have to prep for thousands of permutations of planks wheras they just have to prep one aff making impossible for me to win – That causes psychic burnout

Harris 13Scott Harris (Director of Debate at U Kansas, 2006 National Debate Coach of the Year, Vice President of the American Forensic Association, 2nd speaker at the NDT in 1981). “This ballot.” 5 April 2013. CEDA Forums. http://www.cedadebate.org/forum/index.php?action=dlattach;topic=4762.0;attach=1655

I understand that there has been some criticism of Northwestern’s strategy in this debate round. This criticism is premised on the idea that they ran framework instead of engaging Emporia’s argument about home and the Wiz. I think this criticism is unfair. Northwestern’s framework argument did engage Emporia’s argument. Emporia said that you should vote for the team that performatively and methodologically made debate a home. Northwestern’s argument directly clashed with that contention. My problem in this debate was with aspects of the execution of the argument rather than with the strategy itself. It has always made me angry in debates when people have treated topicality as if it were a less important argument than other arguments in debate. Topicality is a real argument. It is a researched strategy. It is an argument that challenges many affirmatives. The fact that other arguments could be run in a debate or are run in a debate does not make topicality somehow a less important argument. In reality, for many of you that go on to law school you will spend much of your life running topicality arguments because you will find that words in the law matter. The rest of us will experience the ways that word choices matter in contracts, in leases, in writing laws and in many aspects of our lives. Kansas ran an affirmative a few years ago about how the location of a comma in a law led a couple of districts to misinterpret the law into allowing individuals to be incarcerated in jail for two days without having any formal charges filed against them. For those individuals the location of the comma in the law had major consequences. Debates about words are not insignificant. Debates about what kinds of arguments we should or should not be making in debates are not insignificant either. The limits debate is an argument that has real pragmatic consequences. I found myself earlier this year judging Harvard’s eco-pedagogy aff and thought to myself—I could stay up tonight and put a strategy together on eco-pedagogy, but then I thought to myself—why should I have to? Yes, I could put together a strategy against any random argument somebody makes employing an energy metaphor but the reality is **there are only so many nights to stay up all night researching**. I would like to actually spend time playing catch with my children occasionally or maybe even read a book or go to a movie or spend some time with my wife. A world where there are an **infinite** number of **affirmatives** is a world where the demand to have a specific strategy and not run framework is a world that says this community doesn’t care whether its participants have a life or do well in school or spend time with their families. I know there is a new call abounding for interpreting this NDT as a mandate for broader more diverse topics. The reality is that will create more work to prepare for the teams that choose to debate the topic but will have little to no effect on the teams that refuse to debate the topic. Broader topics that do not require positive government action or are bidirectional will not make teams that won’t debate the topic choose to debate the topic. I think that is a con job. I am not opposed to broader topics necessarily. I tend to like the way high school topics are written more than the way college topics are written. I just think people who take the meaning of the outcome of this NDT as proof that we need to make it so people get to talk about anything they want to talk about without having to debate against Topicality or framework arguments are interested in constructing a world that might make debate an unending nightmare and not a very good home in which to live. **Limits**, to me, **are a real impact because I feel their impact** in my **everyday** existence.

#### 2] Ground – 2 Internal links

#### A) Each specification makes linking our DA’s and CP’s significantly harder which forces us to resort to generics that always lose to docced 1ARs and 2ARs

#### B) They can specify the best combination of the three to delink out of core negative ground

#### 3] Fair version of the aff – Only defend one specification and have the rest as an advantage

#### Fairness is a voter: all argumentation assumes it’ll be evaluated fairly which means it’s a gateway issue to other layers

#### Education is a voter: it’s the only portable impact to debate, other impacts won’t matter in 10 years

#### Drop the debater [1] to deter future AC abuse [2] because my strat was already completely skewed by the one abusive practice

#### Competing interps because reasonability invites a race to the bottom where debaters set lower brightlines to defend abuse

#### No RVIs – [A] Illogical – fairness is a burden – they can’t win for following the rules. [B] Incentivizes good theory debaters to run abusive strategies, bait theory, and win off the RVI **[C**] Chilling effect—chills theory because I’ll be scared that they’ll win off the RVI

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier. Norming outweighs A] Constutivism- It’s the constitutive purpose of theory debating B] Sequencing- it’s a pre-requisite to actualizing any other voter like fairness or education

# Theory

#### Interpretation: debaters cannot read both theoretical and substantive justifications for their framework if their opponent only read one type.

#### Violation:

#### Standards;

#### Strat skew - Having both creates functional NiBs- even if I go through all the tjfs, that’s not sufficient to win framing. this creates a 2-1 skew Don’t let them say it’s reciprocal- just because i have the ability to punch them in the face doesn’t mean i should, even if they do and that deincentivizes me from reading frameworks that don’t necessarily maximize things like topic lit.

#### Phil ed – TJFs incentivize picking frameworks based on how good their TJFs are and making the framework debate about theory instead of actually debating warrants. Outweighs on constitutivism – LD is about morality which means we have to preserve that in this round

# Hobbes NC

#### To negate means “to deny the truth of” (Merriam Webster) so presumption and permissibility semantically negate. (https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate)

#### The metaethic is constructivism – truth is not absolute but rather created by individuals based on their own individual perspective. Prefer it

#### [1] Opacity – we can never access another person’s perspective because we can never fully understand how someone else thinks. Every truth I create cannot be universalized because I can’t guarantee that they will create the same truth because they do what they want

#### [2] Linguistics – Truth is constructed by language, which is completely arbitrary. Nothing tells me that a chair is a chair; I only assign it that name arbitrarily because I want to. Meaning can’t be contained within language if we make it up ourselves, and truth doesn’t exist absent language.

#### But, the state of nature leads to infinite violence – competing truth claims means conflicts cannot be resolved. Two warrants:

#### [1] Ambiguity – everyone can assert their own claims to be true and refuse contestation – this means we always fight over who is correct. This is irresolvable because there is no mediator to adjudicate the dispute and tell who is correct – we just fight forever

#### [2] Self-Interest – everyone wants their truth claims to be true because it benefits them – this leads to conflict because we can’t divide limited resources and have to compete with each other – terminates in death because neither of us want to concede to the other

#### The solution is the creation of the sovereign to mediate what is true and enforce the law; she is the ultimate ruler and arbitrator. It must eliminate all conflicts to bring peace to our violent natures.

#### Therefore, the standard is adhering to the state’s perspective.

#### Impact Calculus: Only evaluate impacts to structural purpose –what you justify through doing the action. We can control what we justify but we can’t control what we cause.

#### Prefer my standard additionally

#### 1. Infinite Regress- other moral theories inevitably fail because individuals can question why they follow them, but state basedmorality escapes this because individuals consent to the state by virtue of engaging in it.

#### 2. Constitutivism– other moral theories might matter in the abstract but obligations differ based on the nature of agency. For example, a janitor has different obligations than teachers, in the same vein the state has unique obligations that might be inconsistent with morality in general.

#### Now negate –

#### 1: the state’s perspective determines what is just so if the state decides not to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike that’s what the state has decided is just

#### 2: worker strikes actively defy the state in order to reach a personal goal which moves closer to the state of nature