## T

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives may not specify an authoritarian regime or regimes.

#### Violation:

#### Negate:

#### [1] Semantics—

#### a) omission of an article before “authoritarian regimes” proves the topic concerns regimes as a general classifcation
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UltraLingua (Language Software Company). “Definite Articles.” 2011. http://www.ultralingua.com/onlinedictionary/references/english/38.htm –ilake mw

The definite article does not always precede nouns: sometimes indefinite articles or partitive articles will be used. Often, though, no article at all is necessary, as in the following cases: 1. As a general rule, the definite article is omitted before abstract nouns or nouns representing general categories. It is often omitted after verbs expressing opinions or preferences:

#### b) “ought not” in the resolution implies that the direct and indirect objects are generic. Saying “I ought not provide milk to my cat” does not entail upwards; i.e. it fails to justify “I ought not provide food to animals.”

#### Semantics is a voter—activities are defined by the practices that constitute them.

Schapiro, Tamar. “Three Conceptions of Action in Moral Theory.” Noûs, vol. 35, no. 1, 2001, pp. 93–117. JSTOR, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/2671947](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2671947). --ilake mw

The salient point for Rawls' purposes is that there are constitutive constraints on the exercise of these new powers, constraints by which any participant must abide in order to make her movements count as the moves she intends them to be.30 For example, in order for a judge to "punish" a defendant, she must abide by the deliberative constraints of our legal practice. According to those con- straints, a punishment can only be meted out as a response to the judgment that a defendant is guilty. As such, if a judge were to decide to punish a person for the sake of promoting overall utility, her action would have to be described as something other than punishment-either as an "offense" of a certain kind, or as a "move" in a rather different practice (e.g. a practice of "telishment"). By the same token, Rawls claims, it is not logically possible to "keep a promise" for the reason that doing so would be best on the whole. Promise-keeping is a move in a practice, and it can only be done for reasons which follow from the rules of the institution of promising. Now this characterization of moves in a practice may just seem false, be- cause there appear to be cases where the proper description of an action falling under a practice does not depend in any way upon the whether the agent con- forms to deliberative constraints. Suppose, for example, that a tennis player hits a hard shot right at her opponent's head, and that she does so not out of a desire internal to the practice (i.e. to play competitively), but out of a personal, vengeful desire to physically injure the other player. From the point of view of an umpire, the shot will count just as it would if it followed the exact same trajec- tory but was chosen on the basis of the practice-dependent desire. Similarly if, in her external actions, the utilitarian judge conforms to the procedural rules associated with punishing, she will succeed in doing something which, from a legal point of view, counts as "punishing" the defendant.31 However Rawls' claim is not about what counts as a move in this external, legalistic sense. His claim is that at a philosophical level, there are deliberative conditions which have to be met in order for an agent to count as "making a move" of a particular kind within a practice. This makes sense, I think, if we read Rawls as relying on an unstated assumption. The assumption is that mak- ing a move in a practice is a way of participating in it, a way of engaging in it as a form of activity. Corresponding to this notion of "participation" is an ideal of full participation or full engagement in the activity defined by the practice rules. That ideal is one according to which the agent regards her will, and not merely her external actions, as subject to the action-guiding authority of the practice rules. To fully participate in a practice is to identify oneself and others in terms of the concepts defined by the practice rules, and to regulate oneself in terms of its principles. Thus one who fully participates in a game of tennis re- lates herself as a player to others conceived as players. By contrast, one who settles a personal score on the court merely uses the practice rules to promote a practice-independent end. In this sense she does not fully participate in the ac- tivity defined by the rules. She acts like a player, but not as one.32 If Rawls has this sort of ideal in mind, then his claim is that every action which falls under practice rules is to be regarded as a form of participation, and that the concept of participation is what determines its standard. A participant fully participates, and hence fully "makes a move," only when she makes the practice rules and their associated concepts determinative of her will. On this interpretation, Rawls' claim is that a move is some determinate form of participation, and an action's being a move consists in its being under- taken in conformity with the practice rules under which it falls. Since practice rules are constitutive of the actions falling under them, it is not possible to evaluate an action falling under a given practice from a perspective independent of that practice. To do so, Rawls concludes, is to evaluate the action as something it is not.

#### The topic is constitutive of debate—a) the topic is written and interpreted by camps and governing bodies that form debate’s infrastructure b) tournaments identify the topic as the subject for debate in their invitation

#### [2] Limits – their aff sets the norm where affs would get to choose any authoritarian regime. That skews neg prep and allows for too many affs—impossible to frontline and kills value to life since debaters will always be forced to make tradeoffs between school, family and prep. Affs get to cherry pick and frontline the best offense and always win. Limits key to fairness since it prevents fair engagement and cherry picking affs. TVA solves—they can just read the authoritarian regime they chose as an advantage under whole res but I would get to weigh disads that link to other parts of the resolution.

#### Voters: F, E, DD, No RVI, CI

## 2nr—T

### \*\*Paradigm Issues\*\*

### No RVIs

[omitted]

### Competing Interps

[omitted]

### Semantics Collapse

#### Extend the interp—Affs can’t spec an authoritarian regime or regimes.

#### I’ll go for semantics—extend that [authoritarian regimes is a bare plural, which implies that they shouldn’t be allowed to specify a single regime within the categorization] [and ought not in the resolution means that proving one instance where we shouldn’t give aid doesn’t affirm because it doesn’t prove the resolution as a whole true].

### --prefer sem ! > prag !

#### 1] resolvability—it’s more resolvable to compare semantics because you’re just comparing two definitions, but pragmatics involves weighing between different impacts and how well they connect to voters, which is less resolvable because pragmatics is way more subjective. Resolvability matters because we can’t debate if we don’t decide what the topic means.

#### 2] semantics logn term increases pragmatics—only using pragmatic justifications would justify people reading obscure interpretations of the topic or debating a different topic entirely—proves pragmatics endorses an unpredictable model of debate with no stable ground or clash

#### 3] logic—pragmatic justifications only give a reason why it’d be good if something were true, not why it’s true in the first place. Only semantics can justify the latter, which proves semantics logically comes first. Logic matters since it’s a metaconstraint on all arguments as the purpose of debate is to teach logic.

### --sem > under prag

#### Even they win that pragmatics come first, you should still vote on semantics—a) the topic’s the only stasis for prep since otherwise prep would never clash with each other and we’d lose 100% of research benefits to debate b) the topic was determined deliberatively and revised by people who aren’t debaters—higher probability that ground exists and is equally divided c) topics have contemporary significance—it’d be pointless to debate whether we should increase funding for polio vaccine research.

### --no 2ar SOL weighing

#### Don’t evaluate 2ar strength of link weighing—this menas even if I concede fairness and education, semantics comes first.

#### 1] you shouldn’t use pragmatics as a tiebreaker—that would justify judges intervening against a whole layer to make their decision. Even if the aff wona conceded extinction scenario, you wouldn’t reject T because it categorically comes above the aff. Means it’s not that fairness and education don’t matter, it’s just that semantics is a higher layer.

#### 2] absolute preclusion—their extensions of fairness and education offense will beg the question of whether pragmatics is the terminal impact.

### --semantics > ground

#### 1] probability—aff violates their constitutive obligation to efend the topic 100% of times they don’t defend the resolution, but only sometimes will debaters not have the ground to answer nontopical positions

#### 2] magnitude—being inconsistent with constitutive obligations means that we’re not even debaters, but not having ground can make you a slightly worse debater but you’re still being a debater.

### --semantics > clash

#### 1] reversibility—you can fix lack of clash by uplayering to theory or a K that forces your opponent to clash with you but you can’t re-do the 1ac after the round has started.

#### 2] semantics link turns clash—if we debated a different resolution every round and didn’t know what it was beforehand we’d never have clash anyways since there’d be no stable basis for prep

### --LBL – Schapiro xt

#### Extend Schapiro--Activities are defined by the practices that constitute them—if I hit a tennis ball at my opponent’s head to hurt her, I’m participating in violence, not tennis. Constitutivism is especially key in theory debates since it’s the only binding way to ensure compliance with the practice rules of debate like the topic and speech times—otherwise people will do things they shouldn’t because it helps them win.

### Limits – Fairness collapse

#### Extend the interp—Affs can’t spec an authoritarian regime or regimes.

#### I’ll concede that pragmatics outweigh semantics—this means you can’t vote on any semantics offense they extend in the 2ar.

#### Underneath pragmatics, it’s a question of whether fairness or education comes first—I’ll go for fairness.

### --Fairness > education:

#### 1] intrinsicness—debate can be uneducational, but if debate were unfair, it wouldn’t be a debate, it would be bullying or a rant—proves that education is nonintrinsic to debate.

#### 2] verifiability—we can’t know if we didn’t get the maximum education until after the round because education only appears after the round is over, but we can definitely tell if the round was unfair[—means that the judge doesn’t have the power to vote on education offense because we don’t know if it exists]

#### 3] reversibility—we can’t change unfairness that’s already happened but we can fix education ex post facto by doing research or more rounds

### --limits > pics turn

#### Under fairness, the only offense they have is []. I’ll go for limits—

#### \*\*Limits outweighs the PICs offense\*\*

#### 1] magnitude—exploding limits means that clash is impossible because specifying drastically reduces the outs I have, but even if neg reads pics, they can still generate link or impact turns to the pic

#### 2] scope—limits affects every single round since norms affect how the entire topic is debated, but ground loss only happens in rounds where debaters choose to read pics

#### 3] probability—affs will definitely use their advocacy to exclude neg ground because it makes the 1ar easier, but the risk of losing to pics bad deters most people from reading pics

#### You should reject new 2ar voter or standard weighing—a) it pigeonholes neg into more limited 2nr ballot stories and b) paradigmatically reject new in the 2 weighing—I don’t have a 3nr to answer it

### --LBL Limits xt

#### On limits—extend that the aff explodes limits because they set a model where affs would get to choose any authoritarian regime or combination of regimes—creates thousands of possible advocacies. Even if there are solvency advocates for 10% of those affs, that’s still at least a hundred different affs, [so there’s also no functional limits check]. Impacts out to reciprocity since ground is heavily aff skewed if they get to spec. infinite prep time means they can frontline one unbeatable aff the entire topic but neg will be pigeonholed into the same strategies every round, like the russia/china disad and conditions CP because they’ll use their specifications to exclude any other neg ground in the 1ar. Infinite prep and limited neg flexibility means that aff will always win.

### ---LBL TVA debate

#### Extend the TVA—they should read the exact same offense and only change the advocacy to whole res.

#### They say the tva is overlimiting, but there’s not only one aff—they can read any offense they want, which solves the CI because we can still debate specific scenarios. The net benefit to the TVA is that it equally redistributes ground on either side of the advocacy—the advocacy, not offense constrains what ground is accessible in the round since only the advocacy can be used to delink from offense. That takes out the argument that “I would have to cut the same prep anyways” because it’s not about how much prep I have to do, it’s about what ground is available under the model they set.

### Limits-Education collapse

#### Extend the interp—Affs can’t spec an authoritarian regime or regimes.

#### I’ll concede that pragmatics outweigh semantics—this means you can’t vote on any semantics offense they extend in the 2ar.

#### Underneath pragmatics, it’s a question of whether fairness or education comes first—I’ll go for education.

### --education > fairness:

#### 1] magnitude—fairness is only an in-round deficit but the education we get from debate affects all of our future decisions

#### 2] reversibility—we have a limited amount of time in debate to learn from it but creativity and strategy in the round solve for unfairness

#### 3] probability—there’s a 100% probability that bad args harm education because every second in round incurs an opportunity cost, but the probability that an arg is so unfair that debaters actually have to correct it is small since not every round is decided on theory.

#### Under education, the only offense they have is []. I’ll go for limits—

#### \*\*Limits outweighs depth\*\*

#### 1] controls the internal link—depth only matters if we go deep into both sides of the issue, which is impossible if specifying precludes neg engagement with the aff.

#### 2] magnitude—limits affects norm creation on the topic but depth is nonunique since better debaters will always research in more depth than novices

#### You should reject new 2ar voter or standard weighing—a) it pigeonholes neg into more limited 2nr ballot stories and b) paradigmatically reject new in the 2 weighing—I don’t have a 3nr to answer it

### --LBL Limits xt

#### On limits—extend that the aff explodes limits because they set a model where affs would get to choose any combination of regimes—creates thousands of possible advocacies. Even if there are solvency advocates for 10% of those affs, that’s still at least a hundred different affs, [so there’s also no functional limits check]. Impacts out to engagement since it would be impossible for us to answer the aff if we don’t have prep and they can use their advocacy to exclude generics.

### --LBL TVA debate

#### Extend the TVA—they should read the exact same offense and only change the advocacy to whole res.

#### They say that only having one aff is bad, but there’s not only one aff—they can read any offense they want, which solves the CI because we can still debate specific scenarios. The net benefit to the TVA is that it equally redistributes ground on either side of the advocacy—the advocacy, not offense constrains what ground is accessible in the round since only the advocacy can be used to delink from offense. That takes out the argument that “I would have to cut the same prep anyways” because it’s not about how much prep I have to do, it’s about what ground is available under the model they set.