# Truth Testing NC

## NC [1:15]

#### The Roll of The Ballot is to determine the truth or falsity of the resolution- 4 warrants

#### [1] Textuality- 5 Dictionaries define to affirm as to prove true and negate as to deny the truth of. This has a few implications

#### [A] Grammar- Grammar outweighs since it’s literally what structures our language and argumentation. Double bind- either they reject all grammatical arguments and thus reject communication and the debate itself or they accept grammatical arguments and accept truth testing.

#### [B] Jurisdiction—Truth testing is a constitutive feature of debate, meaning that the judge only has the jurisdiction to arguments that assert the truth or falsity of the resolution-not proving the truth value of the resolution automatically justifies voting neg

#### [2] Necessity- All statements assert implicit truth value i.e. if I say “I smell violets” that is the same as saying “It is true that I smell violets.” This has a few implications.

#### [A] Double bind—either my opponent asserts the truth value of their indicts to truth testing meaning they implicitly accept truth testing as a paradigm or they don’t assert the truth value of their indicts which means that they are false and truth testing is true anyways

#### [B] Even if we’re losing on the framework debate, their framework is going to collapse to truth testing anyways

#### [3] Constituvism- Truth Testing is the only constitutive feature of debate – if affirm and negate means to prove true and deny the truth of then that means it must be constitutively truth testing

Nardin Terry Nardin, “International Ethics and International Law”. Review of International Studies, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Jan., 1992), pp. 19-30, published by Cambridge University Press. The first thing to observe in considering this objection is that the purposes of a practice are not necessarily the same as the purposes either of those who designed or of those who participate in it. From the standpoint of an umpire supervising a particular game of chess, the paramount consideration governing the play is that it should be in conformity with the rules of chess. If a player makes an illegal move, arguing that it will result in a more intellectually challenging game, the proper response is to ignore the argument and prohibit the move. In other words, the kinds of reasons that are valid within the game are different from those that might be considered by chess federation officials contemplating changes in the rules of the game. From the internal perspective of the player or the umpire, the authority of the rules is absolute Players or umpires may disagree about the interpretation or proper application of the rules, but they may not take the position that a valid, authoritative rule should be set aside. It is also important to distinguish between the intentions that may be embedded in a rule or system of rules and the consequences of observing that rule or participating in the system.

**Constitutive aims are important in that they are non-optional**

**Katsafanas 11** [Paul. (2011), “Deriving Ethics from Action: A Nietzschean Version of Constitutivism.” Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 83: 620–660.]

So what’s special about constitutive aims? The constitutive aim’s standard of success differs from these other standards in that it is [are] intrinsic to the activity in question. You can play a chess game without aiming to enjoy it, and a chess game is not necessarily defective if not enjoyed. But you can’t play a chess game without aiming to achieve checkmate, so a chess game is necessarily defective if it does not achieve checkmate. Thus, the interesting feature of constitutive aims is that they generate intrinsic standards of success. Put differently, they generate non-optional standards of success. So the important point about constitutive aims is just this: if action has a constitutive aim, then that aim will be present in every instance of action. Thus, it will give us a non- optional standard of assessment for action, a standard that applies merely in virtue of the fact that something is an action.15

#### [4] Other ROTBs suck- Ground Parity- the wording committee and topic selection process exist to identify topics with a range of defensible arguments on both sides, “role of the ballot” claims can frame the round in ways that make my ground either absurd or morally abhorrent

## Extensions

#### Overview: The Roll of the Ballot is Truth Testing. The burden of the affirmative is to prove the truth value in res, the neg is to deny the truth of the rez. Here is how you weigh the ROTB: Descriptive claims precede normative ones because the normative claim doesn’t matter it its descriptive nature is false, it’s epistemologically useless for us to consider something that’s normatively good if its descriptively false- I.E your normative arguments hold 0 weight until you prove why they are descriptively true as well. This means that even if their ROTB is normatively better, if it’s still descriptvely false use truth testing

#### [1] Extend the Textuality warrant for Truth Testing, this outweighs because our roles are predefined before the round begins. It serves as the common starting point for both sides. Extend the [A] Point that says rejecting Truth Testing is rejecting grammar, the impact is not being able to communicate and thus you extricate yourself from the debate because communication is a prerequisite, or just accept grammar and accept Truth Testing. So use Truth Testing no matter what. Also extend the [B] point which says that the judge is jurisdictionally tied to Truth Testing because it is a constitutive roll of the ballot. Outweighs because to debate LD means to truth test, absent that the activity is not LD and is defective.

#### [2] Extend the Necessity warrant which says that all statements collapse to truth or falsity. A couple massive implications. When you assert indicts against truth testing you implicitly assert a truth value. This means your indicts to truth testing cede the validity of truth testing, hijacks your ROTB and indicts. OR you don’t assert the truth value of your indicts which mean your indicts are false. The implication is that there are no true indicts against Truth Testing, so default to Truth Testing.

#### [3] Extend the Constituvism warrant. Big Mistake. They concede that a constitutive feature of LD debate is to truth test. Thus, if you don’t truth test you aren’t doing LD debate. Thus they aren’t debating and you can drop them here for not debating, that’s an independent voter. - Now extend Katsafanas who says that these aims are non-optional. So even if you think truth testing is bad for debate, it doesn’t matter. It’s descriptive feature of debate to truth test. This takes out all indicts to Truth Testing.

#### [4] Extend the Ground Parity warrant- this puts offense on their ROTB. Their ROTB was made specifically to filter arguments and give them as much ground as possible. Reject them as they kill my ground. If their arguments are good they should be able to affirm in the context of other negative arguments and still prove the truth value of the res.

## NC V2

#### The role of the ballot is to test the truth or falsity of the resolution

#### [1] Logic- Debate is fundamentally a game with rules, which requires the better competitor to win. Every other ROTB is just a reason why there are other ways to play the game but are not consistent enough with the purpose of the game to vote on, just like you don’t win a basketball game for shooting the most 3s.

#### [2] Isomorphism- ROBs that aren’t phrased as binaries maximize leeway for interpretation as to who is winning offense. Scalar framing mechanisms necessitate that the judge has to intervene to see who is closest at solving the problem. Truth Testing solves since it’s solely a question of if something is true or false, there isn’t a close estimate

#### [3] Inclusion: (a) other ROBs open the door for personal lives of debaters to factor into decisions and compare who is more oppressed which causes violence in a space where some people go to escape. (b) Anything can function under truth testing insofar as it proves the resolution either true or false. Specific role of the ballots exclude all offense besides those that follow from their framework which shuts out people without the technical skill or resources to prep for it.

#### [4] Textuality- 5 Dictionaries define to affirm as to prove true and negate as to deny the truth of. Implication

#### [A] Grammar- Grammar outweighs since it’s literally what structures our language and argumentation. Double bind- either they reject all grammatical arguments and thus reject communication and the debate itself or they accept grammatical arguments and accept truth testing.

## Ext

### Overview

#### The Roll of the Ballot is to prove the truth or falsity of the resolution. If we win a single descriptive argument as why truth testing is the ROTB use truth testing. Descriptive reasons come before the normative because the normative can’t work without it being already true which means the normative only works if the descriptive is true. We will win on both layers that truth testing is descriptively true and normatively good.

### Logic

#### They’ve conceded the Logic warrant for truth testing- They conceded that logic is a meta-constraint on argumentation because absent logic argumentation collapses to down to meaningless and unpersuasive language- the impact to this is that if we win truth testing is logically necessary, all their normative reasons for why truth testing bad go away, this also means that this warrant for truth testing accesses a higher layer than their normative reasons for why truth testing bad. Now extend that debate is game with rules and other ROTB aren’t consistent with the true purpose of the game- means you default to truth testing.

### Textuality

#### Extend the Textuality warrant for Truth Testing, this outweighs because our roles are predefined before the round begins. It serves as the common starting point for both sides. Extend the [A] Point that says rejecting Truth Testing is rejecting grammar, the impact is not being able to communicate and thus you extricate yourself from the debate because grammar is a meta-constraint on communication. Flow this as an independent voter. Also extend the [B] point which says that the judge is jurisdictionally tied to Truth Testing because it is a constitutive roll of the ballot. Outweighs because to debate LD means to truth test, absent that the activity is not LD and is defective.

### Neccessity

#### Extend the Necessity warrant which says that all statements collapse to truth or falsity. A couple massive implications. [A] Hijacks your roll of the ballot because it collapses down to truth testing and [B] When YOU ASSERT your indicts to truth testing you implicitly assert a truth value which means you accept a truth testing paradigm- which means we also hijack your indicts against truth testing.

### Isomorphism

#### Extend the Isomorphism argument- ROTB that aren’t binary are bad because they maximize leeway for interpretation as to who is winning offense. That causes judge intervention to see who is closest at solving a problem. That means truth testing solves because it’s judging only the truth and falsity of the rez.

### Inclusion

#### TT doesn’t require debaters to speak from personal identity or positions they don’t know or understand or have an outside perspective on since any offense can function under it and thus you can do what your good at and I can do what I can---inclusion turns your ROB since if I can’t engage in the debate there’s no value to your ROB

## Frontlines

### A2 Judge vote on Non-K aff

#### [1] literally proves nothing. This argument just shows that it’s possible to break jurisdiction. Jurisdiction is not something that is impossible to break. Police Officers break jurisdiction but at that point they aren't acting like officers. When an officer relentlessly kills someone unprovoked, they aren't being a police officer according to their constitutive duties.

#### [2] that means you aren’t even debating LD, that K round was defective. You haven’t met the constitutive aim of LD. It’s intrinsic.

### A2 Allows for NIBS

#### [1] Non-Uq. Debate already has a bunch of Nibs. Speaking, being topical, being present.

#### [2] Non-Uq- Under comparative worlds debaters read 4 T shells with no RVI’s which means your model of debate does nothing to solve for nibs. Err on Truth testing because we have descriptive and normative reasons as to why you should prefer truth testing.

#### [3] C/A nardin. Appeals to education/fairness don’t outweigh the rules of the game as they are absolute. Just because you think being able to move a pawn 3 spaces forward is better for education/fairness and makes the game more fair doesn’t mean anything, the rules are absolute.

### A2 Reciprocity

#### [1] Maximizes ground for both sides – aff just has to prove one instance of moral obligation neg just has to prove this instance false.

#### [2] No sidestepping of offense – it’s not the assumptions of the res we’re questioning, we’re just saying that we’re proving it false.

#### [3] Comparative worlds leads to a bunch of unreciprocal advantage CPs that solve the aff while being only net beneficial – bad for education as the CPs will be poorly researched. This also leads to less topical research – people will just use generic impact evidence or generic advantage CPs but truth testing forces us to engage in the topic

#### [4] Not easier to prove the resolution false – they’re equal for every a priori that proves the resolution false there is one that proves it true - comparative worlds gives the neg more ways to win – they get multiple positions and advocacies in the NC but the aff only gets on advocacy truth testing fixes this skew because they each get only 1 advocacy.

### A2 Clash

#### [1] Nonunique: Clash is still present in TT: we just debate on the truth or falsity of the resolution doesn’t incentivize less clash we still have to clash on the framework debate

#### [2] Turn Clash: Comparative Worlds kills any clash that we have because you just weigh risk of offense off some impossible extinction scenario which avoids real discussion

#### [3] Turn education: TT is key to education it allows us to question the underlying assumptions of the aff and the moral obligations enforces strong phil debates by proving the truth or falsity of the res phil debates outweighs – it’s the only constitutive feature of debate i.e. the ought in the res

### CW Bad

#### [1] Education- excludes all but consequentialist positions, means you exclude a bunch of educational phil their- Truth Testing allows for any argument, means we are more inclusive and educational.

#### [2] RWE- the res is a claim that the aff proves with a plan, it’s not a plan on its own. When policymakers evaluate statements, they first determine whether or not the statement is true, then how they should implement them, not the other way around, -which means truth testing comes lexically prior

### N-Word/ Rhetoric

#### [1] Non-Uq, Comparative worlds is only post-fiat which means it can’t indict in round actions

#### [2] Fairness is a meta-constraint on truth, so that solves for the rhetoric argument.

#### [3] Non-Uq- you win in basketball by scoring more points, but if someone commits an egregious violation they are taken out of the game, same thing for debate. Means we can still use truth testing, and if someone decides to be an ass we take them out of the round which means they logically auto-drop which solves all

### Overing and Scoggin

#### [1] Nonsense0 your rob can’t account for what judges do when a competitor punches their opponent. It’s impossible to account for everything

#### [2] TT accounts- You’d lose because exclusion doesn’t say the res is a good idea- just that you’re an awful person which means you wouldn’t get the ballot.