**(2:10)**

**A: Interp:** The aff must defend Public colleges and universities in the United States ought not restrict any constitutionally protected speech.

Any is defined as[[1]](#footnote-1) used to refer to **one or some of a** thing or **number of things, no matter how** much or **many**.

Prefer my definition

a) Common usage: First definition on Google outweighs-

1. Everyone has access to it- controls internal link to all their fairness claims, access is infinite abuse because you can’t correct it

2. Most predictable, people don’t search for a million different definitions, they use the one on Google and that’s what they prep for

3. Real world because it’s the dictionary definition meaning it’s the basis for the use of the term, even if people contextualize it in different ways

**B: Violation:** You specify a right or a number of rights- not restricting any speech means you cannot restrict even one.

**C: Reasons to prefer:**

**1. Textuality-** A specification of the restrictions doesn’t meet the definition of any because it necessarily requires they defend no restriction. It doesn’t matter how fair the aff is, if it doesn’t affirm the topic they haven’t met the aff burden. And, Textuality link turns other theory standards because it is the basis for claims to things like predictability and ground because the resolution is all we have entering the round. There are two impacts **a)** It’s an independent reason you drop them because they haven’t met their constitutive burden, the judge doesn’t have jurisdiction to vote on non topical arguments and **b)** The aff is functionally neg ground which means I’m winning substance.

**2. Topic Lit-** Core of topic lit is a discussion on whether free speech should be restricted, not what aspects of speech to restrict. **Nowicki,** Nowicki | March 15, 2013 at 1:40 Am, Jenn. "Can Universities Restrict Free Speech On Campus?" Generation Progress. N.p., 13 Mar. 2013. Web. 10 Dec. 2016. <http://genprogress.org/voices/2013/03/15/18613/can-universities-restrict-free-speech-on-campus/>.This year marks the 25th anniversary of **a Supreme Court decision** that **gave schools the right to restrict students’ free speech**. Originally intended for high schools, many **universities have come to use Hazelwood** School District **v. Kuhlmeier to control** their image and reputation—at the expense of a **free press on campus**. “I think schools have just completely lost their minds,” Adam Goldstein, attorney advocate for the Student Press Law Center, told Campus Progress. “**It’s resulted in just real basic confusion about what civil rights mean**.” The case centered around a Missouri student newspaper at Hazelwood East High School, where articles on teenage pregnancy and divorce were rejected by the school principal. The newspaper's faculty adviser filed suit against the school district under **the Tinker v. Des Moines** Independent Community School District (1969) **Supreme Court precedent**, which **guaranteed the right to free speech for** high school **students, and had spawned over 150 other legal cases** that upheld student first amendment rights. But the Court sided against the student newspaper, ruling that school administrations could restrict student speech “so long as their actions are reasonably related to legitimate pedagogical concerns.”

Topic lit is an independent voter- There’s a reason we’re debating the topic, it’s a constitutive rule of the round which means it is functionally another function of textuality which means you have no jurisdiction to vote on it. Also controls the internal link to fairness and education because if it’s in the topic lit you should’ve prepped it and we should talk about it. Generic Plans good arguments don’t turn the shell- Nowicki says this topical specifically makes plans bad.

Drop the debater on T 1. Drop the arg is severance from the position of the 1AC-you can just read new arguments in the 1AR or connect parts of the aff to whole res which is equivalent to kicking the aff and reading a new plan in the 1AR-skews my strat since I don’t know what you’ll argue for. 2. Drop the arg discourages the neg from reading T to check back abusive affs since they will lose the portion of the 1nc they spent arguing T, making it more strategic to let the aff get away with their non-topical affs which kills fairness and education since affs will get away with sketchy positions. 3. T has to be drop the debater because they necessarily haven’t fulfilled their constitutive burden

No RVIs. 1. Illogical. Just because you are fair doesn’t mean you should win. If that were true, both debaters would win rounds without theory, which would be irresolvable, and resolvability comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Chilling effect. Either I read theory and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness. 3. Topical clash. RVIs kill substantive debate. Once theory is initiated we can never go back to substance, because it’s unnecessary so nobody will engage in the topic.

Competing interps since 1. Any brightline is arbitrary and bites judge intervention 2. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom to see who can be the most abusive under the given brightline 3. Competing interps forces a race to the top-an offense defense paradigm fosters good norms for the activity.

1. https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0ahUKEwjesevp7-jQAhUJ1GMKHdNfAAkQFggyMAE&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.merriam-webster.com%2Fdictionary%2Fany&usg=AFQjCNHj0kSgNT\_skxUhYTper5znJGdw0Q&sig2=zcI9EAthnCZh55igkFLo0w&bvm=bv.141320020,d.cGc [↑](#footnote-ref-1)