# Theory AT roro’s Benhabib fw

## Theory

#### Interpretation: If the standard is consistency with interactive universalism, debaters must take a stance on whether our evaluation of the resolution occurs in a context of justification or of application. To clarify, debaters may not defend both the Generalized and Concrete Others—they should evaluate the resolution with respect to either the Generalized or the Concrete Other.

#### Violation: Their framework just establishes the conditions that direct us to choose the criteria that we use to make decisions. The thesis of interactive universalism is that contexts of principles’ justification mean we should use Generalized theories, whereas contexts where principles are applied require attention to Concrete characteristics of identity.

#### The standard is strat skew:

#### Defending two conceptions of subjectivity in different contexts creates a 2-1 skew in how I can answer your framework—if we defend a theory that has a Concrete conception of subjectivity, they can just extend the Generalized component of their framework and argue that debate or the resolution is a context of justification so both our framework and the offense under it don’t matter, and vice versa if our framework is Generalized. Kills topic education since they will use their framework to preclude impacts on the contention debate and harms phil ed since rather than engaging our framework 1:1, they’re incentivized to shift out of what their framework says in the 1ac and avoid clash. Also harms fairness since there’s a structural irreciprocity—they have two ways to win their contention offense but we only have one.

#### Voters—F, E, dd, no rvis, CI

## Frontlines

### The general thinking behind this shell

* If debates about the res occur in a context of justification, we would assess whether the resolution has legitimacy as a principle (i.e. as a Kantian maxim)
* If the debate occurs in a context of application, we would assess the material impacts of doing the aff and weigh between its effects on different identity groups/individuals
* If the 1nc picks one and engages on that level, they can always reframe in the 1ar and be like “no this debate should be a question of whether the res is a legitimate principle” or “no this debate should be a question of the aff’s effects on people”
* This framework should honestly be a metaethic (because generalized v concrete is just a metaethical distinction) and/or a way to preempt Ks when reading kant (or vice versa, a way to preempt kant when reading a k)

### AT “you can say that GO/CO contradict each other”

#### 1] The Generalized and Concrete others don’t contradict each other—Benhabib says that contexts of justification and application are separate and that the GO and Co should be used in different instances

#### 2] doesn’t solve strat skew—you’ll still leverage an arg about contradictions in the framework against us to trigger skep or indict the 1nc’s conception of subjectivity

### AT “the framework is procedural”

#### 1] it’s not a procedural—you make claims about interactive universalism being action-guiding or binding, which means the framework alone should be sufficient to guide action, not just decisions

#### 2] procedural frameworks are bad—they allow affs to coopt both framing and contention offense because procedural frameworks are always articulated as a “higher layer” or “prior question”

#### 3] your framework isn’t a complete procedural, which proves abuse. Absent determining whether the resolution is a context of justification or application you haven’t explained the how the “interactive” component of interactive universalism works…which defeats the point of the framework and allows you to shift in the 1ar!

### AT “it’s both”

#### This literally is not what Benhabib says—she differentiates between the two contexts because assessing them at the same time causes value propositions without clash between them…which proves why ur fw is abusive. goodbye

### AT bUt i wAnT tO rEaD bEnhAbiB/phil ed CI

#### 1] The interp link turns this—the way you read Benhabib lets you preclude our framework justifications without interacting with them, which is net worse for phi led since ethics is about resolving different intuitions

#### 2] Benhabib doesn’t impose any singular value system on the world when discussing Concrete versus Generalized subjectivity—her aim is to preserve plurality—means your framework should be a metaethic that tells us how to choose value systems

#### 3] you can read Benhabib—use it as a way to preempt Ks when reading Kant s

### AT “it’s obviously justification” / “it’s obviously application”

#### 1] it’s not clear enough from the ac since your contention offense is about benhabib’s discourse ethics—this is just ex post facto specification. also substantively, presume neg since their offense doesnt explain why interactive universalism affirms

#### 2] too little too late—I still constructed 1nc strat based on the presentation of the 1ac so you don’t solve for strat skew offense