# 1

#### Interp: Debaters must disclose round reports on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki for every round they have debated this season. Round reports disclose which positions (AC, NC, K, T, Theory, etc.) were read/gone for in every speech.

#### Violation: screenshot in the doc – they have one

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### 1] Level Playing Field – big schools can go around and scout and collect flows but independents are left in the dark so round reports are key to prep- they give you an idea of overall what layers debaters like going for so you can best prepare your strategy when you hit them. Accessibility first and independent voter – it’s an impact multiplier

#### 2] Strategy Education – round reports help novices understand the context in which positions are read by good debaters and help with brainstorming potential 1NCs vs affs – helps compensate for kids who can’t afford coaches to prep out affs.

#### 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 abuse [2] because my strat was already completely skewed by the one abusive practice

#### Competing interps [A] reasonability invites a race to the bottom because debaters will justify increasingly greater abuse by setting lower brightlines [B] competing interps leads to better norm setting because it forces us to think about how to defend our norms as the best for debate [C] reasonability invites judge intervention because it’s unclear what should be considered reasonable [D] reasonability collapses to competing interps because it relies on an offense-defense paradigm

#### 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

#### 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 - It’s the constitutive purpose of theory debating

# 2

#### 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

#### This state of nature is brutish and has no conception of morality because we don’t have any unified truth to guide us, and thus outweighs on magnitude. 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.

#### 3. TJFs – morality’s a definition of the word ‘ought’ which means it can be evaluated as a topicality issue

#### [a] Resolvability – other debates create a mess of weighing and link turns, but using Hobbes is easily resolvable because it becomes a question of what the sovereign believes. Independently indicts their framework, we can’t act on it if every action required endless consideration

#### [b] Political Education – politicians have to understand the social contract in order to know what powers they have and what they have to provide citizens, and debating about Hobbes helps us learn about that.

#### Now negate –

#### 1: the state’s perspective determines what is just so if the state decides not to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines then that’s what the state has decided is just.

# Case