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# 1NC

## Long O/V

**The role of the ballot** is to vote for the debater who best proves the truth or falsity of the resolution on a post-fiat level. The aff’s burden is to prove the res true, the neg’s is to prove it false. Any neg argument that denies the truth of the aff would thus be sufficient to negate. Prefer:

1. To affirm means “**to say that something is true.**” To negate means **“to deny the truth of,**” means **A**. prefer my ROB on predictability: The text is from the NDCA, so that’s what people expect the debate to be, else you kill my ability to engage with the aff in the first place, means this link turns reasons to prefer alternate roles of the ballot, since your ROB assumes engagement under it is good but that’s impossible if we don’t use mine **B.** since the aff’s burden is to defend an absolute prohibition as per the term “ought not,” then any neg arg that denies such a prohibition would be sufficient to negate, so presume neg since negating has no positive connotation and permissibility negates **C.** indicting assumptions negates since it denies the fact that the resolution can be true by making it logically incoherent **D.** Truth testing is the only role consistent with textuality. That’s a jurisdictional issue - when the judge signs the ballot they’re saying the better debating was done by the aff.

2. Jurisdiction: The only possible conclusion of the rules given to us prior to the round is that judges must use a truth-testing model. **Branse**:[[1]](#footnote-1)

Second, the delineation of an “affirmative” and a “negative” establishes a compelling case for a truth testing model. These titles establish unique rules for the debaters receiving them. The roles of these debaters are not to be abstract “debaters” or “advocates”, but to be an aff and a neg. Their obligations are contextualized by their roles.

“affirm”[2] is defined as “to prove true”

“negate”[3] is defined as “to deny the truth of”

Thus, the burden of the debaters in the round are contextualized clearly within the scheme of truth testing. They are not educator[s] one and educator two, or advocate[s] one and advocate two, but two debaters constrained by the rules of their assignment – to uphold or deny the truth of the resolution. Thus, the “better debater” can only be defined in terms of the duty of the debaters. As I established before, the standard of assessment is contextualized by the role. A trumpet player would not be the better trumpet player for playing the flute and a soccer player would not be better at soccer for scoring a touchdown. Thus, judging the quality of the debaters requires a reference to their roles. The better aff is the debater who is better at proving the resolution true. The better neg is the debater who is better at denying the truth of the resolution. The ballot requests an answer to “who did a comparatively better job fulfilling their role”, and s[S]ince debaters’ roles dictate a truth-testing model, the judge ought to adjudicate the round under a truth testing model of debate. The judge does not have the jurisdiction to vote on education rather than truth testing.

Reasons why truth-testing is bad aren’t responsive – judges must use since it’s the only way they can even possibly use. Means the conclusion of the aff ROB is mine, so even if they win theirs, use truth testing. Jurisdiction is a voter since it’s a side constraint on the ballot – you assume the judge has the jurisdictional capacity to evaluate an argument when you make it.

3. Truth is a necessary part of any statement since any statement fundamentally asserts that some property is true. For example, saying “I smell the scent of violets” is the same as “it is true that I smell the scent of violets.” Therefore, all roles of the ballot devolve into some conception of truth and thus a truth testing paradigm since when you assert that your role of the ballot is true you concede to the validity of truth testing.

4. Any other paradigm not grounded in the inherent nature of the resolution functionally makes the judge responsible for instilling some kind of education but that means the judge can just intervene against any argument in the name of education. That makes debate pointless since judges can just intervene against the debater who wins the flow, getting rid of any incentive for debaters to engage and make arguments. That implies that enforcing any particular educational paradigm is problematic, turning reasons to prefer alternate roles of the ballot since they undermine debate’s fundamental purpose.

## Short O/V

To affirm means “**to say that something is true.**” To negate[[2]](#footnote-2) means “**to deny the truth of**” which implies **a)** since the aff’s burden is to defend an absolute prohibition as per the term “ought not,” then any neg arg that denies such a prohibition would be sufficient to negate, so presume neg since negating has no positive connotation and permissibility negates **b)** that indicting assumptions negates since it denies the fact that the resolution can be true by making it logically incoherent **c)** when you sign the ballot you are saying the better debating was done by the neg, which is only sensical under truth testing so that’s the only paradigm in your jurisdiction. To clarify, any neg argument that denies the truth of the aff is sufficient to negate. Jurisdiction is a voter since it’s a side constraint on the ballot – you assume the judge has the jurisdictional capacity to evaluate an argument when you make it **d)** prefer truth testing on predictability: The resolutional text is from the NDCA, so that’s what people expect the debate to be. Else you kill my ability to engage with the aff in the first place - means this link turns reasons to prefer alternate paradigms, since your ROB assumes engagement under it is good but that’s impossible if we don’t use truth testing.

## NC

For us to know whether the public colleges ought not limit speech, they must be able to see themselves as the cause of their actions:

1) Identifying your action as your own means aligning the act with the principle of choice for your act. But, that’s only possible you know that your act is chosen on principle, not desire. **Korsgaard**:[[3]](#footnote-3)

The first step is this: To conceive yourself, as the cause of your actions is to identify with the principle of choice on which you act. A rational will is a self-conscious causality, and a self-conscious causality is aware of itself as a cause. To be aware of yourself as a cause is to identify yourself with something in the scenario that gives rise to the action, and this must be the principle of choice. For instance, suppose you experience a conflict of desire: you have a desire to do both A and B, and they are incompatible. You have some principle which favors A over B, soyou exercise this principle, and you choose to do A. In this kind of case, you do not regard yourself as a mere passive spectator to the battle between A and B. Youregard the choice asyours, as the product ofyour own activity, because you regard the principle of choice as expressive, or representative, of yourself. You must do so, for the only alternative to identifying with the principle of choice is regarding the principle of choice as some[a] third thing [and] in you, another force on a par with the incentives to do A and to do B, which happened to throw in its weight in favor of A, in a battle at which you were, after all, a mere passive spectator. But then you are not the cause of the action. Self- conscious or rational agency, then, requires identification with the principle of choice on which you act.

Every framework must presuppose being the cause of your action otherwise agents would never be responsible for the acts they take – without responsibility, moral theories would fail because agents could just reject their obligation.

2) Actions are expressions of reasoning from means to the end, which unifies fragmented physical steps into a cohesive movement. **Rodl**:[[4]](#footnote-4)

We can give a more specific description of the consciousness of temporal unity that constitutes that unity: it is an act of reasoning. For example, she who is crossing the street because she is getting bread reasons [that] in this way: wanting to get bread, she thinks the fact that the bakery is across the street is a reason to cross the street. She reasons from her end (getting bread) to the means (crossing the street). The unity of the movement represented in “She is doing A” is constituted by reasoning of this form: she is doing A by holding together in one consciousness her idea of doing A and her idea of doing B, being conscious of her nexus.

Outweighs – every framework presupposes that an agent can take action but only my framework gives an account of action.

Thus, the sufficient neg burden is to prove that the res is an impossible course of action. The aff must defend that it’s possible.

Negate:

1. Colleges and universities aren’t agents – they’re made of a conglomeration of agents, who make decisions together after reconciling their differences. However, that doesn’t make these bodies agents since they don’t have principles that are constitutive of them, and so they cannot will an action and so they can’t see themselves as the cause of their own actions. That means that the res is just an incoherent statement, so you cannot evaluate it.

2. What counts as constitutionally-protected speech is subject to the various views of judges – what counts as “clear and present danger” differs based on region and individual judge. That implies that the res is incoherent- there can’t be a conception of what constitutionally protected speech is, so negate since I’ve proven an assumption of the res false.

3. The aff cannot take an action since the res is a negative obligation not to restrict rights. Any action that either protects rights of free speech or restricts rights is neg ground. Impacts: A. proves the aff definitionally impossible since the res is tautologically false B. no aff solvency – it’s impossible to prove that an agent isn’t restricting rights, since rights violations cannot always be empirically verified. You can’t know that everyone’s rights aren’t violated at a given time.

4. We cannot see ourselves as the cause of our actions if every action is just caused by physical laws of which I have no control over. **Inwagen**[[5]](#footnote-5):

“Physics teaches us that All physical changes transpire in accordance with the laws of nature. Now my firing of the gun, along with my aunt’s ensuing death, were physical events. So, if the dictates of science are to be accepted, these **[All] events were** ultimately **the outcome of events occurring** in (say) 2 **million[s of years ago]** B.C., **together with the laws of nature. But it is not up to me what went on** 2 million years ago. And it is [also] not up to me **[nor] what the laws of nature are** either. Therefore, **the consequences of these things, including my present actions, are not up to me either.**”

Even thought follows this pattern since I am dependent on how I was raised or how my parents were. That means free will is impossible, and thus the resolution isn’t a meaningful statement if it doesn’t truly tell me how I’m supposed to act.

### More Contentions

Consequences can’t be predicted – you can never be sure that any action truly has the impact of restricting speech since other factors can come up in the future that make it impossible to know whether the goal of not restricting speech has truly been achieved. Getting rid of barriers to free speech can’t ever be truly ensured.

There will always be borderline constitutional cases where it’s unclear whether a right is being violated since interpretations of constitutionality will depend on arbitrary judge rulings. There’s no actual determinant of constitutionality aside from mercurial human judgment. Fundamentally means the aff is impossible and you negate on face since new constitutional issues with free speech arise all the time, so any attempted action to not restrict speech rights will inevitably fail.

The constitution can be changed, which means the aff isn’t a stable and unified action. In order for the aff to truly not restrict rights, we’d need to know every possible future decision appeals courts or the Supreme Court make, which is impossible, so you negate on face.

It is the naturalistic fallacy to assert that anything in the world is identical with moral goodness or what obligates us. Goodness is not a property of an object, **Pidgen[[6]](#footnote-6)**:

For any naturalistic or metaphysical ‘X’, **if ‘good’ meant ‘X’, then** (i) **‘X things are good’ would be a** barren **tautology, equivalent to** (ii) **‘X things are X’ or** (iii) **‘Good things are good’.** (1.2) For any naturalistic or metaphysical ‘X’, if (i) ‘X things are good’ were **a** barren **tautology**, it **would not provide a reason** for action (i.e. a reason to **promote X-ness**). (1.3) So for any naturalistic or metaphysical ‘X’, **either** (i) ‘X **things are good**’ **does not provide a reason for action** (i.e. a reason to promote X-ness), **or ‘good’ does not mean ‘X’.**

Since good cannot be attached to an object, goodness as obligation cannot exist and normative statements are false, **Pidgen 2**:

Indeed ‘**ethical judgments** claim objectivity’; that is they purport to tell it like it is. However, this ‘claim [to] objectivity … makes them **[are] all false. Since there is no property** of goodness **corresponding to** the linguistic predicate **‘good’, nothing can ever possess it.** Hence, any claim that friendship or anything else is good will be false, since there is no such thing as goodness for [anything] friendship or pleasure to be. The same goes for badness. Moreover, if there is no such thing as goodness or badness there is no such thing as rightness either, since for an action to be genuinely right it must be such that it can reasonably be expected to produce more good and less bad than any alternative. But if there is no such thing as goodness to be produced, no action can be expected to produce more of it than any other. Of course, an action can still be relatively right: more likely to produce more of what somebody believes to be good and less of what somebody believes to be evil than any alternative. But **no action can be genuinely right or** genuinely **obligatory, since there are no such properties as goodness** or badness for conscientious agents to maximize or minimize.

Proves the res onf ace false because we cannot locate goodness in a specific property in the world that might make an act good, thus the term that you ought to do something is impossible

# Extensions

## Truth Testing Extension

Extend that to negate means to deny the truth of, and the impact underneath that when you sign the ballot for the better debater, the only coherent paradigm is truth testing. That means that the only paradigm in the judge’s jurisdiction is truth testing. Your practical disadvantages with truth testing aren’t competitive with my argument, so there’s no impact to them. That means it’s the only one that’s possible for them to use regardless of however it’s bad, and even if they use another one, my argument is that judges should stick to what is within their jurisdiction.

### ROB Weighing

My role of the ballot is truth testing, which outweighs alternate ROBs:

1. Jurisdiction: your rob presumes the jurisdictional ability to evaluate it in the first place, but the best way to fulfill that ability is through judge’s truth testing, which is the only rob that textually meets the res, means the ultimate conclusion of your ROB being true is still that you use truth testing.
2. All statements posit that something is true or false, conceding to the ultimate importance of truth and falsity, means that all ROBs collapse to mine.
3. Ground: I include the most arguments – literally nothing is excluded, whereas yours arbitrarily permits and excludes certain arguments we make.

### Theory Weighing

Outweighs theory:

1. Theory doesn’t prove the truth or falsity of the res, but rather whether an action was abusive, or whether my actions might have affected the ability to determine the truth of my arguments, but those things aren’t relevant in proving the resolution’s truth.
2. ROB determines the ultimate obligation of the judge and why we’re debating, so we don’t even care about theory’s function unless we have the rob to contextualize theory.

# FW Frontlines

## AT Util – NC

1. Rodl takes out the framework since consequences cannot be part of the initial intent, and so util cannot unify the different steps involved in acting, else action would be a meaningless collocation of infinitely small steps. Morality at the highest level is a guide to action, so my framework is the only way to solve for theirs.
2. My framework best accounts for Korsgaard’s conception of agency since I say that a constitutive feature of your being an agent is that you must first see yourself as the cause of your own action, which means that my framework is a precondition to even evaluating the aff’s, since it doesn’t matter if we care about it in a vacuum if cannot understand what I means to be an agent.

## AT Actor Specificity – 2NR

Actor specificity is literally exactly what the neg framework is, two features that are required of any agent. That’s a prior question to your actor specificity warrants since my args are about the inherent nature of any agent. Next extend Rodl, the unity of action – I outline that this is a requirement for any ethical theory, which you don’t account for, so the neg framework outweighs since strength of link determines strength of impact, and I have the only link to unity of action whereas we both equally link into actor specificity.

# Contention

## AT Turns

The NC is a NIB:

1. The NC is a side constraint to action, both the framework and the contention
2. Offense is just a bunch of nibs since they say that the res is incoherent or impossible, but proving that the res is coherent or possible isn’t a reason to vote for you under any paradigm, especially truth testing.
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