## T – Any

### 1NC – “Any” T [Generic]

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must defend removing restrictions on ALL constitutionally protected speech.

#### Any is defined as every

Your Dictionary NO DATE (Your Dictionary, online reference, “any,” http://www.yourdictionary.com/any///[LADI](http://www.theladi.org/evidence))

every: any child can do it

#### Any is an indefinite pronoun that refers to things generally

Language NO DATE (Online English grammar textbook, Unit 42: - Indefinite Pronouns,” http://www.1-language.com/englishcoursenew/unit42\_grammar.htm///[LADI](http://www.theladi.org/evidence))

**Indefinite pronouns replace specific things with** general, non-specific concepts. For example: - I want to live abroad in Italy. - I want to live abroad somewhere. This unit covers indefinite pronouns made with some, any, no, and every. Some / any Some and any can be combined with "-thing" to refer to an undefined object. For example: - There's someone outside the door. - There isn't anyone in the office. Some and any can be combined with "-where" to refer to an undefined location. For example: - I'm looking for somewhere to live. - We don't want to live anywhere near here. Some and any can be combined with "-body" or "-one" to refer to an undefined person. There is very little difference in meaning between "-body" and "-one". For example: - If you have a problem, someone/somebody will help you. - Do you know anyone/anybody who can help? These compound nouns follow the same rules as some and any, that is some is used in affirmative statements, and any is used in negative statements and questions. For example: - I need something from the supermarket. - I don't need anything from the supermarket. - Do you need anything from the supermarket?

#### Restrict is defined by Merriam Webster as

to subject to bounds or limits

#### Violation: The plan ends restrictions surrounding specific forms of speech

#### Net Benefits—

#### Limits – allowing plan affs around specified kinds of speech justifies a limitless number of affs that ban types of speech i.e. hate speech, specific words, and speech in specified time and places, the list goes on and on. Two impacts—

#### Fairness—means that the neg has a limitless number of affs to prepare case negs to which results in shallow engagement and the same generics you’ve heard every day like the politics DA and a process CP. Fairness is a voter, debate is a competitive activity and both sides need equal access to the ballot.

#### Education—shallow engagement means we never actually learn about the aff topic lit in depth—it results in most debates being about T or a generic K, not about the aff which destroys education—education is a voter it’s the reason why schools fund debate.

#### Topical version of the aff – remove restrictions surrounding all forms of constitutionally protected speech – solves 100% of your offense because it ensures we can still discuss the aff but allows for the neg to access links to our generics.

### 1NC – “Any” T [TPM]

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must defend removing restrictions on ALL constitutionally protected speech. The affirmative may only defend removing specific restrictions on time, place, or manner of protected speech.

#### Any is defined as every

Your Dictionary NO DATE (Your Dictionary, online reference, “any,” http://www.yourdictionary.com/any///[LADI](http://www.theladi.org/evidence))

every: any child can do it

#### Any is an indefinite pronoun that refers to things generally

Language NO DATE (Online English grammar textbook, Unit 42: - Indefinite Pronouns,” http://www.1-language.com/englishcoursenew/unit42\_grammar.htm///[LADI](http://www.theladi.org/evidence))

**Indefinite pronouns replace specific things with** general, non-specific concepts. For example: - I want to live abroad in Italy. - I want to live abroad somewhere. This unit covers indefinite pronouns made with some, any, no, and every. Some / any Some and any can be combined with "-thing" to refer to an undefined object. For example: - There's someone outside the door. - There isn't anyone in the office. Some and any can be combined with "-where" to refer to an undefined location. For example: - I'm looking for somewhere to live. - We don't want to live anywhere near here. Some and any can be combined with "-body" or "-one" to refer to an undefined person. There is very little difference in meaning between "-body" and "-one". For example: - If you have a problem, someone/somebody will help you. - Do you know anyone/anybody who can help? These compound nouns follow the same rules as some and any, that is some is used in affirmative statements, and any is used in negative statements and questions. For example: - I need something from the supermarket. - I don't need anything from the supermarket. - Do you need anything from the supermarket?

#### Restrict is defined by Merriam Webster as

to subject to bounds or limits

#### Literature about constitutionally protected speech centers on time, place, and manner restrictions, not content-based restrictions

Legal Dictionary ["Time, Place, and Manner Restrictions"] AZ

The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees Freedom of Speech. This guarantee generally safeguards the right of individuals to express themselves without governmental restraint. Nevertheless, the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment is not absolute. It has never been interpreted to guarantee all forms of speech without any restraint whatsoever. Instead, the U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that state and federal governments may place reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of individual expression. Time, place, and manner (TPM) restrictions accommodate public convenience and promote order by regulating traffic flow, preserving property interests, conserving the environment, and protecting the administration of justice.

#### Violation: The plan ends restrictions surrounding specific forms of speech

#### Net Benefits—

#### Limits – allowing plan affs around specified kinds of speech justifies a limitless number of affs that ban types of speech i.e. hate speech, specific words, and speech in specified time and places, the list goes on and on. Two impacts—

#### Fairness—means that the neg has a limitless number of affs to prepare case negs to which results in shallow engagement and the same generics you’ve heard every day like the politics DA and a process CP. Fairness is a voter, debate is a competitive activity and both sides need equal access to the ballot.

#### Education—shallow engagement means we never actually learn about the aff topic lit in depth—it results in most debates being about T or a generic K, not about the aff which destroys education—education is a voter it’s the reason why schools fund debate.

#### Topical version of the aff – remove restrictions surrounding all forms of constitutionally protected speech – solves 100% of your offense because it ensures we can still discuss the aff but allows for the neg to access links to our generics.

### T Voter

#### 1. Drop the debater:

#### Dropping the argument is severance since it gets rid of the aff advocacy. You have nothing to vote for so drop the argument is the same as drop the debater

#### A new 1AR advocacy forces me to read new 2NR offense the 2AR can make 1 response to and get rid of, and gives the aff 7 minutes to my 6 which lets them auto-win substance

#### It’s the ultimate punishment since the greatest incentive is to win – dropping them is the strongest deterrent against abusive practices, which prevents greater abuse in future rounds even if it over-punishes in this round

#### 2. Competing interps –

#### It sets norms since we find the best practice for debate which checks more abusive practices in the future

#### Reasonability leads to a race to the bottom since people will constantly toe the line and read increasingly abusive arguments

#### Reasonability is arbitrary since we don’t know what is “reasonable,” inviting judge intervention or random unjustified thresholds

#### 3. No RVIs

#### Chills theory – fear of the loss discourages debaters from running theory to check abuse and encourages abuse. Good theory debaters will run abusive positions to bait theory and win the round. That’s specifically true for T – T as a no-risk issue is key to setting norms on the topic and limiting out affs

1. Forces theory – RVI’s center the debate on theory since substance has zero utility, so each speech has an incentive to go solely for theory, which
	* + 1. Destroys all substantive education – every round theory will be ONLY theory – it’s the biggest impact given the massive proliferation of T and solvency advocates theory on this topic
			2. Kills aff strategy since going for theory in the 2N makes the 2AR harder since they have to win both theory and substance, exacerbating the time skew
			3. *Kills evaluation of the better debater since the judge’s jurisdiction is to determine the better debater via the resolution, and theory is only justified when abuse makes that impossible – making every round theory destroys that*

#### *On T the aff shouldn’t win for being topical – they can pick the 1AC and T can’t be read against affs in the core of the topic so they should have the burden of being topical. On plans as well, T is a key check against new affs that push the limits on the topic – RVIs kill this strategy*

### 2NR – "Any" Definitions

#### Textuality – repeated court rulings go neg.

Elder ‘91 (David S. Elder, October 1991, "Any and All": To Use Or Not To Use?” "Plain Language' is a regular feature of the Michigan Bar Journal, edited by Joseph Kimble for the State Bar Plain English Committee. Assistant editor is George H. Hathaway. Through this column the Committee hopes to promote the use of plain English in the law. Want to contribute a plain English article? Contact Prof. Kimble at Thomas Cooley Law School, P.O. Box 13038, Lansing, MI 48901, <http://www.michbar.org/file/generalinfo/plainenglish/pdfs/91_oct.pdf> | SP)

The Michigan Supreme Court seemed to approve our dictionary definitions of "any" in Harrington v Interstate Business Men's Accident Ass'n, 210 Mich 327, 330; 178 NW 19 (1920), when it quoted Hopkins v Sanders, 172 Mich 227; 137 NW 709 (1912). The Court defined "any" like this: "In broad language, it covers 'arl'v final decree' in 'any suit at law or in chancery' in 'any circuit court.' Any' means ,every,' 'each one of all."' In a later case, the Michigan Supreme Court again held that the use of "any" in an agency contract meant "all." In Gibson v Agricultural Life Ins Co, 282 Mich 282, 284; 276 NW 450 (1937), the clause in controversy read: "14. The Company shall have, and is hereby given a first lien upon any commissions or renewals as security for any claim due or to become due to the Company from said Agent." (Emphasis added.) The Gibson court was not persuaded by the plaintiff's insistence that the word "any" meant less than "all": "Giving the wording of paragraph 14 oJ the agency contract its plain and unequivocable meaning, upon arriving at the conclusion that the sensible connotation of the word any' implies 'all' and not 'some,' the legal conclusion follows that the defendant is entitled to retain the earned renewal commissions arising from its agency contract with Gibson and cannot be held legally liable for same in this action," Gibson at 287 (quoting the trial court opinion). The Michigan Court of Appeals has similarly interpreted the word "any" as used in a Michigan statute. In McGrath v Clark, 89 Mich App 194; 280 NW2d 480 (1979), the plaintiff accepted defendant's offer of judgment. The offer said nothing about prejudgment interest. The statute the Court examined was MCL 600.6013; MSA 27A.6013: "Interest shall be allowed on any money judgment recovered in a civil action...." The Court held that "the word 'any' is to be considered all-inclusive," so the defendants were entitled to interest. McGrath at 197 Recently, the Court has again held that "[alny means 'every,' 'each one of all,' and is unlimited in its scope." Parker v Nationwide Mutual Ins Co, 188 Mich App 354, 356; 470 NW2d 416 (1991) (quoting Harrington v InterState Men's Accident Ass'n, supra)

#### Any refers to a broadening – it expands the scope to include everything

Simon 16 (Cecilia, reporter @ the NY Times, “Fighting for Free Speech on America’s Campuses,” August 1, 2016, [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/07/education/edlife/fire-first-amendment-on-campus-free-speech.html//LADI](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/07/education/edlife/fire-first-amendment-on-campus-free-speech.html//utd-va) \*italics in original) //[LADI](http://www.theladi.org/evidence)

**Title IX prohibits discrimination** based on sex in federally funded educational programs. In the last five years, as **the government** has worked to crack down on sexual assault on campus, it **has broadened the definition of sexual harassment to “*any* unwelcome conduct of a sexual** nature” and eliminated a protection that such conduct had to be offensive to a reasonable person.

#### Any refers to every

Your Dictionary NO DATE (Your Dictionary, online reference, “any,” http://www.yourdictionary.com/any///[LADI](http://www.theladi.org/evidence) )

every: any child can do it

#### Field context – legal restrictions use any to refer to all

Black’s Law NO DATE (Black’s Law Dictionary, online legal dictionary, “Law Dictionary: What is ABANDONMENT OF CHILD?” http://thelawdictionary.org/abandonment-of-child///[LADI](http://www.theladi.org/evidence))

**What is ABANDONMENT** OF CHILD? **Deserting** a child and having no intention of fulfilling **any obligations** to the child. **Cutting off** all **relations** and obligations to the child.

#### Prefer – theirs is about "any" in general, but ours is specific to the law – that proves our interp

#### Any refers to all legally – prefer our ev it’s in the context of free speech

Danilina NO DATE (S., staff writer for black’s law dictionary, “Is Flag Burning Illegal?” http://thelawdictionary.org/article/is-flag-burning-illegal///[LADI](http://www.theladi.org/evidence))

Interesting that the burning of the flag has been against the law until 1969. The first U.S. Supreme Court ruling on flag desecration was passed in 1907 in Halter vs. Nebraska case. Most early flag desecration statutes prohibited burning a flag or any other ways of disrespecting the flag. Later, in 1968, Congress responded to the burning of the American flag in the Central Park as the protest against the Vietnam War by passing the Federal Flag Desecration Law. This law prohibited any display of “contempt” directed against the flag. Thus, burning of the American flag had been illegal until 1969 when the Supreme Court ruled the decision to award the First Amendment protection to the burning of the flag.

#### Any is an indefinite pronoun that refers to things generally

Language NO DATE (Online English grammar textbook, Unit 42: - Indefinite Pronouns,” http://www.1-language.com/englishcoursenew/unit42\_grammar.htm///[LADI](http://www.theladi.org/evidence))

**Indefinite pronouns replace specific things with** general, non-specific concepts. For example: - I want to live abroad in Italy. - I want to live abroad somewhere. This unit covers indefinite pronouns made with some, any, no, and every. Some / any Some and any can be combined with "-thing" to refer to an undefined object. For example: - There's someone outside the door. - There isn't anyone in the office. Some and any can be combined with "-where" to refer to an undefined location. For example: - I'm looking for somewhere to live. - We don't want to live anywhere near here. Some and any can be combined with "-body" or "-one" to refer to an undefined person. There is very little difference in meaning between "-body" and "-one". For example: - If you have a problem, someone/somebody will help you. - Do you know anyone/anybody who can help? These compound nouns follow the same rules as some and any, that is some is used in affirmative statements, and any is used in negative statements and questions. For example: - I need something from the supermarket. - I don't need anything from the supermarket. - Do you need anything from the supermarket?

### 2NR Overview

#### Definitions for topicality must be applied to the specific wording of the resolution. A topical aff removes restrictions on ALL constitutionally protected speech. The wording of the resolution doesn’t allow the aff to specify one type of speech, but DOES allow them to specify a type of restriction to remove – for instance, they can remove restrictions on the time that protests are allowed or where speech is allowed.

#### First impact is limits. There are infinite types of speech in the US, which means that there is an exponential number of affs. Their interp justifies affs that remove limits on climate change denialism, criticism of militarism, anti-Israel speech, and journalism. Their interp allows the aff to pick any type of speech that's good and remove restrictions on it.

#### Limits outweigh:

#### Research Burdens- creates infinite out of round abuse because I have to research every aff, while they can predict possible negative positions.

#### Kills clash- the discussion becomes one-sided since only the aff is prepared. Especially true when their aff is so small that nothing links.

#### Predictability- aff is better prepped on case since they are allowed to cherry pick groups of people. Solvency advocate doesn’t check, exponential groups of people means that there are tons of possible advocacies.

#### Topic Lit- The aff is incentivized to pick plans farthest from the core of the lit, or groups that obviously affirm. They can pick groups such as people on the terror list, which kills equal access to offense by making it impossible to negate.

#### Second is ground. The size of their aff takes out core neg ground such as the Hate Speech DA and core neg generics that don't link to the aff.

### 2NR Ground [Journalism]

#### They also deny us key ground about spoken word –

## 2NR Answers

### A2 Neg Reads PICs

#### Theory solves PICs ex post facto –for instance, word PICs might be allowed under truth testing but people can run external theory to solve. My interp doesn’t need total explanatory power to solve.

#### The aff should have a defense of free speech in general – counter-speech and underground speech apply to nearly every speech-specific PICs, but the neg has no such recourse since speech-specific affs just have to defend that a type of speech is good, but not that regulation of that speech is effective, which is an additional premise the neg has to win

#### Non-unique: negs will PIC out of different colleges– specifying a group doesn't uniquely exclude PICs

#### Their interp incentivizes word PICs and tricky generics because the neg can't substantively engage with the specifics of the aff

#### It's better for the neg to read a PIC about a specific group – for the counterplan to be competitive, there needs to be disad for net benefits and there's always some way for the aff to make a solvency deficit to the counterplan. But if the aff specifies a group, the neg has no way to win

### A2 Overlimiting

#### 1. whole res has robust and nuanced ground on both sides. Hall 02

Kermit Lance Hall (August 31, 1944 – August 13, 2006) was a noted legal historian and university president. He served from 1994 to 1998 on the Assassination Records Review Board to review and release to the public documents related to the assassination of U.S. President John F. Kennedy. Free speech on public college campuses overview, Friday, September 13, 2002 EE

Free speech at public universities and colleges is at once the most obvious and the most paradoxical of constitutional principles. It is obvious because given the nature of academic inquiry, only an open, robust and critical environment for speech will support the quest for truth. At the same time, universities are at once communities that must balance the requirements of free speech with issues of civility, respect and human dignity. They are also part and parcel of the larger social order with its own, often competing set of values. Public universities are particularly rich grounds for conflict over matters of speech. They bring together persons with often strongly held yet contradictory views. Universities, for example, have their own newspapers, some of which may be operated by the university, by the students or by an off-campus group. Public institutions in their diversity often have students and faculty of different political persuasions, sexual orientations and religious commitments. Moreover, one of the driving concepts of the university campus is academic freedom, the right to inquire broadly, to question and to promote an environment where wrong answers, seemingly absurd ideas and unconventional thought are not just permitted but even encouraged.

#### 2. Specific advantage areas solve their offense – the aff can specify and weigh free speech zones against other constitutional restrictions.

#### 3. Our interp allows for spec on universities and types of schools – military academies, University of California system, vocational schools, community colleges, etc. Our interp just changes what the AFF can spec.

4. Innovation inevitable – debaters will find ways to change strategies and make whole res arguments more nuanced in order to win more rounds. There’s a never-ending amount of topic lit and diverse warrants for both sides of the topic.

### A2 Research skill

#### 1. Lead to bad research - Under our interp, negs will go more in depth and have time to research more nuanced objections. Negs get spread way too thin and can’t keep up with the litany of different affs. This o/w’s – it doesn’t matter how much we research if we learn bad research practices and have to half-ass each case neg to make sure we have answers to every aff.

#### 2. Non-Unique – negs aren’t going to concede the case and teams that will prep plans will also prep advantages is and specific turns case arguments. So, if the aff picks an advantage area, the neg will still have to prep it.

#### 3. Not true – hardly anyone crafts specific case negs to each position. Our newspapers aff was disclosed for 4 months now and people still haven’t come up with good case specific research.

#### 4.Begs question of topic lit – there’s an infinite number of subject matters we could research, but legal precedent determines what’s within the scope of the topic.

#### 5. Ground outweighs – it doesn’t matter how much research we do, if they skew the debate to their side than it doesn’t matter how much we research, if they can pick subject matter where the neg ground is awful.

### A2 limts – Generics Check

#### 1. Breaking new AFF’s means in a world with plans the neg will get hosed – we can’t do research for every possible AFF and their interp allows the AFF to break one offs that are unpredictable.

#### 2. Even if there’s only a few affs that make it to the end of the topic, they can pick unbeatable aff’s that screw neg generics.

#### 3. This topic is huge – there are an infinite number of different circumstances and types of restrictions. Even if there’s not a ton of lit on it, the aff only needs one good article to craft an AFF. Shallow lit has never stopped plans before.

### A2 Disclosure

#### 1. Doesn't solve our ground offense – disclosure doesn’t mean there is prep.

#### 2. There are hundreds of wiki pages with different affs, disclosure is good but not sufficient to solve our limits offense.

#### 3. Competing interps takes it out – even if your aff is disclosed, not everyone’s will be. Our interp is better because it ensures neg responses to those assholes who keep their affs secret.

#### 4. This justifies reading any nonsense aff they want as long as they disclose it, obviously that’s worse than our interp.

### A2 Any is "Some"

#### "Some" means a particular subset without distinction – means the aff may derive advantages from particular types of free speech, but may not ONLY defend one distinction

#### Common usage – "any" clearly means all types of free speech – just as the sentence "You shouldn't be eating any junk food" does not mean that you can continue to eat some types of junk food

### A2 Caselist Violates Interp

#### Specifying a municipality/city/state or a type of handgun doesn’t violate our interp. The focus is on the whether or not people can still privately own handguns in the world of the plan. A ban means that no one can own handguns since the ability of the gun to be privately owned would be prohibited.

### A2 Their Aff Key/Trapped in a Birdcage

#### Topical version of the aff solves their offense and means any risk of the limits DA comes first. They can read a whole res aff claiming a IPV advantage like our aff.

### A2 Overlimits/Generic Debates

#### Our interpretation provides a reasonable case list. You can spec a group of colleges like Loyola's UC system aff.

### A2 No Risk Constitution NC

#### Non-unique- the 2nd amendment isn’t specific to the ability of a certain groups to bear arms which means that all affs will link.

#### No impact – topics have built in arguments for both sides – the politics DA inevitably exists on most topics, which is just a stock neg arg

### A2 Examples of Affs

#### Loyola- Minutemen

#### HW- IPV

#### Lynbrook- Stalkers

#### Terror Watchlist People- debated in Congress

#### David Min- Law enforcement

### A2 Definition Flaw

#### Even if there’s a flaw with my definition, you should evaluate this debate as if it were T – the flaw just criticizes my definition, but doesn’t actually indict my interpretation, which is supported by the standards

### ---A2 Not every plan broken

#### This misses the point – obviously not every single one of a thousand plans will be broken; it’s that ANY one could be read, and the neg simply cannot prep them all. More likely than not, when the aff picks one aff out of the ten thousand they could read the neg won’t have answers to it.

#### It still increases the neg prep burden – given the number of plans negs will try to put together a strategy against each one, spreading themselves thin in the process – the aff will be more deeply prepared on any given plan which also reduces depth of education

### ---A2 Aff skew

#### The aff skew is due to people not reading plans. Reading a college-specific plan is MORE THAN ENOUGH to overcome the aff skew since the aff prep advantage means they’ll far out-prepare the neg. All the analysis above prove why that can compensate; including hundreds of more affs over-compensates

## HW Specific Answers

### A2 Any is "Some"

#### "Some" means a particular subset without distinction – means the aff may derive advantages from particular types of free speech, but may not ONLY defend one distinction

#### Common usage – "any" clearly means all types of free speech – just as the sentence "You shouldn't be eating any junk food" does not mean that you can continue to eat some types of junk food

### A2 Von Eintel

#### Their counter-interp isn't textually based on the res – it says a specific venue, but von Eintel allows the aff to spec any type of speech – the counterinterp doesn't set a predictable limit and doesn't fit on T

#### Taken out of context – the SCOTUS decision says that "any" only refers to specifics IF the object of the law is clear – however, NOTHING about the res even implies journalism since it just says speech in general. T debates are about what the topic implies, not their plan text – obviously "any" in the plan refers to journalist speech, but that's because they added those words to the resolution.

### A2 Incoherent Whole Res

#### Empirically denied – many whole res debates are effective

#### Although there are different types of protected speech, they all share characteristics that make debates resolvable – for instance, marketplace of ideas, democracy impacts, innovation

### A2 Neg Reads PICs

#### Theory solves PICs ex post facto –for instance, word PICs might be allowed under truth testing but people can run external theory to solve. My interp doesn’t need total explanatory power to solve.

#### The aff should have a defense of free speech in general – counter-speech and underground speech apply to nearly every speech-specific PICs, but the neg has no such recourse since speech-specific affs just have to defend that a type of speech is good, but not that regulation of that speech is effective, which is an additional premise the neg has to win

#### Aff specification is more underlimiting – the aff only needs to find articles that say a type of speech is good, but the neg needs to find evidence that a type of speech is bad AND that colleges should ban it

#### Non-unique: negs will PIC out of different colleges– specifying a group doesn't uniquely exclude PICs

#### Their interp incentivizes word PICs and tricky generics because the neg can't substantively engage with the specifics of the aff

### A2 HW PICs Arg

#### On their A point –

this assumes that 1AR skew is bad, but it's actually harder to be neg

* know framework better, waste less time
* nc has to adapt and prep dozens of frameworks and advantages, which decrease speed and overall quality
* over-allocation on every 1AR arg evens out the time

#### On their B point –

Venue isn't supported by their interpretation – it's about any type of speech

Hundreds of venues can be specced – beyond a point the sheer number of PICs doesn't matter since we can't prep them anyway

#### On their C point

aff also has generics – that was above

their generics are better than ours – the neg has to resort to absolutist arguments like Wilderson or fiat bad that are extremely easy to answer

solvency advocates and lit check proliferation of abusive PICs – the neg needs to find an author supporting the creation of regulation on a type of speech, but the aff doesn't have to meet the same burden – they only need to find an author saying that a specific type of speech is good and should be continued to be protected, which is far easier than someone saying that a NEW LAW should be created